United Nations A/C.1/60/PV.20

General Assembly
Sixtieth session

Official Records

First Committee
20th meeting
Wednesday, 26 October 2005, 3 p.m.
New York

Chairman: Choi Young-jin ..... (Republic of Korea)

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Agenda items 85 to 105 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman: Today, the Committee will take action on draft resolutions that appear in revised informal working paper 3, which contains 14 draft resolutions in six clusters. Cluster 1 contains three draft resolutions; cluster 2, one; cluster 4, three; cluster 5, one; cluster 6; three; and cluster 7, three.

We begin with cluster 1.

I now call on delegations wishing to speak in explanation of position or vote before the voting.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I should like to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.28, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

The Russian Federation will vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Japan. We note the positive and constructive work undertaken by the delegation of Japan in preparing the draft. Russia has provided detailed information to the First Committee concerning the principles underpinning our position on the draft resolution on nuclear weapons. It is important to us that we not underestimate the progress that has been made in that sphere with respect to the obligations of Member States and their fulfilment. We are prepared to adopt a realistic and balanced approach to the issue.

Mr. Prasad (India): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolution entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: Accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", as contained in document A/C.1/60/L.4.

India remains committed to the goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. India also shares the view that nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation are mutually reinforcing. We continue to believe that the best and most effective non-proliferation measure would be a credible, time-bound programme for global, non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament.

Given that the draft resolution seeks a nuclear-weapon-free world, we would have preferred references in it to no first use and non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States, as well as to the reduction of nuclear dangers through de-alerting and other measures, as such steps would be important interim measures which would facilitate the move towards a world free of nuclear weapons.

We find instead that those and certain other specific proposals contained in the resolution adopted last year are not reflected in the draft resolution now placed before us. Furthermore, India cannot accept the call to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as a non-nuclear-weapon

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

05-57125 (E)

State. In urging India to do so promptly and without conditions, the draft resolution moves away from the practice of not referring by name to States not party to a treaty. It thus negates customary international law, as enshrined in the Vienna Law of Treaties, which lays down that no legal obligation can be imposed on a country without its sovereign consent. It is also in marked deviation from the resolution adopted last year, which removed many of the prescriptive suggestions that were not central to the main objective of the resolution.

Our objections to the final document of the 2000 Review Conference of the States Parties to the NPT are well known. We shall therefore be constrained to vote against the draft resolution.

Ms. Mtshali (South Africa): I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the partners of the New Agenda Coalition — Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Sweden and my own country, South Africa — to explain the New Agenda's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.28**, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", that was submitted by Japan this year.

The New Agenda Coalition believes that the First Committee must send a strong message in pursuit of the objective of a nuclear-weapon-free world. That is particularly relevant in view of the failure of the 2005 Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) to achieve any substantive outcome, as well as the inability of the recently concluded General Assembly High-level Plenary Meeting to reach agreement on matters relating to nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. The sixtieth anniversary of the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki further underscores the need for renewed determination to realize the vision of a nuclear-weapon-free world.

A need exists for greater coherence and determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons. In that context, and without prejudging our future position, the States members of the New Agenda Coalition will vote in favour of the Japanese draft resolution, notwithstanding our preference that it contain stronger references to practical steps for nuclear disarmament and the unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals, as agreed upon at the 2000 NPT Review Conference.

Mr. Abdelaziz (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): In addition to the explanation of vote made by the representative of South Africa on behalf of the New Agenda Coalition on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.28, our delegation would like to add some elements that contributed to our changing our voting intention on the draft resolution this year.

At the outset, I extend my thanks to the delegation of Japan for its positive work on the draft resolution and for taking into consideration the many issues whose amendment we urged.

Despite the fact that the draft resolution does not fulfil all our wishes, and given the fact that its adoption coincides with the sixtieth anniversary of the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and our keen interest in the total elimination of nuclear weapons on this occasion, as well as in solidarity with Japan, and in emphasis of Egypt's political priorities on this core issue, we have decided to abandon our abstentions of past years to a vote in favour of the draft resolution this year.

In that connection, Egypt does not objectively oppose the strengthening of the safeguards regime or the contents of the Additional Protocol. However, we have reservations concerning the international community's focus on generalizing the issue because our position is governed by two main factors.

First, we stress the fact that accession to the Additional Protocol is optional. Secondly, Egypt is not prepared to enter into additional commitments at a time when a single State in the Middle East insists on remaining outside the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and continues to refuse to place its nuclear programme under the comprehensive safeguards regime of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Mr. Mine (Japan): I would like to make a few remarks on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/60/L.4, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: Accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", which Japan will support in the voting.

Before doing so, however, I must recall the regrettable outcome of the 2005 Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), as well as the 2005 world summit outcome, which found no agreement on the substantive issues related to disarmament and non-

proliferation. We must try our best to ensure that such a lack of consensus does not erode the existing disarmament and non-proliferation regimes, and for that purpose it is essential that all Member States solidify their efforts to promote disarmament and non-proliferation.

Last year, Japan took the decision to support the New Agenda Coalition resolution and continues to do so this year, even though Japan does not necessarily agree with all of the points contained in the draft resolution. In that regard, Japan is very pleased at and highly appreciates the fact that all New Agenda Coalition member countries will vote in favour of Japan's draft resolution on nuclear disarmament. Japan hopes that such mutual efforts and cooperation will help to create a strong momentum to further strengthen disarmament and non-proliferation.

Mr. Carriedo (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like to explain Spain's vote on the draft resolution on the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty, contained in document A/C.1/60/L.8.

Spain has always taken the view that nuclear-weapon-free zones created on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at by consensus among the States of a region make an important contribution to strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation regime and efforts to achieve nuclear disarmament. More specifically, Spain has unequivocally stated its support for the goals set forth in the Pelindaba Treaty as a way of maintaining the absence and preventing the installation of nuclear weapons in a neighbouring continent and of reflecting our desire to see the Treaty enter into force as soon as possible.

As reflected by the guidelines adopted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission at its 1999 substantive session on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned, every zone is the product of specific circumstances and must reflect the diversity of situations existing within it. Every nuclear-weapon-free zone must be a well-defined geographic entity.

In that regard, after very carefully considering the invitation extended to Spain to join Protocol III to the Pelindaba Treaty, my Government, in consultation with our Parliament, decided that it was not appropriate to accede to that Protocol and so informed the depositary of the Treaty, for two principal reasons.

First, the Pelindaba Treaty contains no provision, obligation, guarantee or safeguard in the field of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation that Spain has not already adopted throughout its national territory, clearly including those parts that fall within the geographical zone to which the Treaty applies. Indeed, through its ratification of other international treaties and implementation of various unilateral measures, Spain is legally and irreversibly committed not to produce nuclear weapons, to denuclearize its entire territory militarily, and to use nuclear energy exclusively for peaceful purposes. Moreover, as a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM), the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Spain has already undertaken and abides by a series of obligations and safeguards that go well beyond those provided for in the Pelindaba Treaty.

Secondly, the signing and subsequent ratification of Protocol III would create a redundant nuclear control regime over those parts of Spanish territory that, in accordance with the Treaty, fall within its geographical purview but are already subject to the comprehensive nuclear monitoring carried out by the aforementioned agencies — IAEA, EURATOM, OSCE and NATO — throughout Spanish territory.

Allow me to elaborate our rationale further. I stress that Spain is a country that abides by a wide range of commitments in the fields of nuclear weapons control and nuclear non-proliferation. In addition to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Spain has also ratified the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, the Convention on Nuclear Safety and the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management. By the same token, on 14 September, Spain signed the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism. All of Spain's nuclear facilities are devoted exclusively to the peaceful use of nuclear energy and subject to the dual monitoring of the IAEA and EURATOM in the framework of the generalized safeguards agreement between the non-nuclear-weapon States members of the European Union and the IAEA. Moreover, Spain, together with the said States, has ratified the Additional Protocol of the generalized

safeguards agreement, which provides for verification standards well beyond those embodied in the Pelindaba Treaty. Spain is also pleased to contribute to the IAEA-African Regional Cooperation Agreement programme, financing projects for the peaceful applications of nuclear energy in Africa.

Furthermore, those parts of Spain's territory falling within the geographical area to which the Treaty applies are, in their entirety, an integral part of the European Union and therefore of the process of political and economic integration that the Union embodies. With respect to the specific field of security, they are an integral part of the Washington Treaty, the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, and the 1994 Vienna Document on confidence-building measures. The aforementioned parts of Spain's territory therefore fall within the boundaries of the European Union, NATO and OSCE and consequently should not have been included *ab initio* in the area covered by the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty.

Finally, I would recall that all of Spain's territory, including those parts that fall within the geographical area to which the Pelindaba Treaty applies, was denuclearized militarily pursuant to the Treaty of Friendship, Defence and Cooperation signed with the United States in 1976. That denuclearization has been reaffirmed in successive revisions of that Treaty in 1982, 1988 and 2002. By the same token, a ban on the introduction, installation or storage of nuclear weapons throughout Spanish territory was included in the parliamentary authorization to the Spanish Government to accede to the NATO Treaty in October 1981. That 1981 decision of the Spanish Parliament to denuclearize all Spanish territory militarily was reiterated in 1985 prior to the March 1986 consultative referendum that decided on Spain's accession to NATO. Spain therefore enjoys with NATO the status of a militarily denuclearized country throughout its national territory. Spain has thus renounced the production of nuclear weapons, militarily denuclearized its entire national territory, is committed to the exclusively peaceful use of nuclear energy, and has contracted to and abides by obligations that go well beyond those provided for in the Pelindaba Treaty.

Moreover, the application of the Treaty to those parts of Spanish territory that fall within the geographical area to which the Treaty applies would create a redundant and unnecessary nuclear control regime, since they are already subject to the comprehensive monitoring throughout Spanish territory of the four international organizations I cited earlier: IAEA, EURATOM, OSCE and NATO.

I reiterate that my country has always considered nuclear-weapon-free zones to be an important contribution to strengthening international peace and security and that it fully shares the goals set forth in the Pelindaba Treaty. Spain has therefore always joined in the consensus on the First Committee's resolution on the Treaty since it was first introduced in 1997.

However, the Spanish delegation, as it stated after the consensus adoptions of the resolution in 1997, 1999, 2001 and 2003, does not consider itself to be bound by that consensus with respect to operative paragraph 3, regarding which we retain serious reservations because the Spanish authorities have concluded decisively and irreversibly that Spain cannot sign or ratify Protocol III to the Pelindaba Treaty for the reasons that I have enumerated.

We have tried since 1997 to persuade the sponsors of the resolution, which remain unchanged this year, of the need to find a more balanced wording of operative paragraphs 2 and 3. The current wording is clearly discriminatory in singling Spain out among the six countries concerned by the Protocols to the Pelindaba Treaty, while the remaining five countries are referred to by the broader formula embodied in operative paragraph 2. Indeed, the difference between my country and the nuclear-weapon States is that the latter are not singled out individually with respect to any obligation under the Pelindaba Treaty, but are assigned a collective responsibility under operative paragraph 2.

All the good faith and transparent efforts made by Spain to achieve more balance in the wording of operative paragraphs 2 and 3 have been in vain. Both paragraphs have remained unchanged every two years. That situation is unsatisfactory to the Spanish delegation.

Let me reiterate once again that Spain does not seek to modify the Pelindaba Treaty or its Protocols; it seeks only to modify operative paragraph 3 of the biannual resolution of the General Assembly in order to make it acceptable to all interested parties. As everyone knows, the last time the First Committee considered the resolution in 2003, my delegation presented a written amendment to operative

paragraph 3, which we later withdrew in order to preserve consensus on an issue of such importance to my country, confident as we were that our legitimate concerns would be met. Furthermore, my delegation noted that unless an acceptable solution were found before the First Committee's consideration of the draft resolution in 2005, Spain would not join the consensus.

Nevertheless, in order not to add new and disturbing elements to the somewhat egregious situation of disarmament and non-proliferation issues in multilateral forums, the Spanish delegation decided not to challenge the consensus on the draft resolution before us. We trust that, over the next two years, we can reach satisfactory wording for operative paragraph 3. I take this opportunity to announce that the Spanish delegation shortly intends to initiate consultations to that end with other interested delegations. I am confident that, in the context of those consultations and in a spirit of dialogue and pragmatism, we will be able to achieve a result satisfactory to all.

Mr. Hamid (Islamic Republic of Iran): My statement is in regard to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/60/L.28, "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution this year, in contrast with our abstention on the resolution last year. That change is due mainly to the positive changes made to the draft resolution. However, we think that the draft resolution could be further strengthened in aspects relevant to nuclear disarmament measures and obligations. We believe that the draft resolution should have been further strengthened with respect to the reaffirmation of the importance of the practical steps agreed within the Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

While the draft resolution touches on some concepts, such as the universalization of the Additional Protocol, that are still far from enjoying general agreement among the States parties to the NPT — and we express our reservations with regard to that concept — it lacks sufficient emphasis on some other aspects of nuclear disarmament that have received great support from the international community, mainly on the important role of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

However, my delegation can associate itself with the spirit, approach and many elements included in the text, and will therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. Matambo (Zimbabwe): My delegation wants to indicate that Zimbabwe is withdrawing its name from the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.4.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, but before we do, let me announce that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.8 — "African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty" — have requested a deferral of action on the draft resolution. There will therefore be no deliberation today of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.8.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.4.

A recorded vote has been requested. A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 4.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.4 is entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: Accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of South Africa at the Committee's 8th meeting on 10 October.

The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.4 and A/C.1/60/INF.2. In addition, Jordan and Kenya have become co-sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Committee will now proceed to take a separate vote on operative paragraph 4, which reads as follows:

> "Further calls upon all States parties to spare no efforts to achieve the universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and urges India, Israel and Pakistan, which are not yet parties to the Treaty, to accede to it as non-nuclear weapon States promptly and without conditions".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia,

Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia

Against:

India, Israel, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Australia, Bhutan, Cameroon, France, Jamaica, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Operative paragraph 4 was retained by 148 votes to 3, with 9 abstentions.

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.4 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, India, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Australia, Belarus, Bhutan, Estonia, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Micronesia (Federated States of), Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.4 was adopted by 144 votes to 5, with 19 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.28. A recorded vote has been requested.

The Secretary: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.28, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Japan at the 20th meeting on 26 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.28 and A/C.1/60/INF/2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Burkina Faso, Costa Rica, Niger, Uzbekistan and Germany.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bhutan, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Israel, Myanmar, Pakistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.28 was adopted by 166 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions.

The Chairman: I shall now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their position after the vote.

Mr. Rivasseau (France): I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the United Kingdom, the United States of America and France, to explain our negative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.4, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". This draft resolution has been submitted over a number of years, and contains important elements that we support.

However, when the draft resolution was submitted last year, we were sorry to find that the text

still contained many elements that did not command consensus and were not acceptable to the United Kingdom, the United States of America and France. We note that this year this text takes a more pragmatic approach. Nevertheless, certain elements are not acceptable to us. The title does not reflect the progress being made towards nuclear disarmament. The content of the draft resolution does not take due account of a full range of obligations on the part of all of us towards nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament, or the most pressing contemporary challenges to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and global security.

As we stated in our explanation of vote on this draft resolution last year, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and France remain fully committed to meeting our obligations, as strictly provided for under article 6 of the NPT. We have taken significant measures on nuclear disarmament ourselves, and support nuclear weapons reduction worldwide. Unfortunately, this draft resolution does not take sufficient account of the progress that has been made in this regard. All previous resolutions mentioned the Moscow Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reductions. This is not the case this year, despite the fact that the Treaty in question commits the United States and Russia to reduce their nuclear arsenals by several thousand warheads over the next decade.

We are committed to exploring ways to achieve progress and strengthen the global disarmament and non-proliferation regime. We continue to believe that the international community must take responsibility and address the serious threat posed to peace and security by proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. We hope that ongoing dialogue among States parties will help lead to a future strengthening of the NPT.

Ms. García (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela attaches priority attention to and totally supports the elimination of nuclear weapons. That is why we have voted in favour of the draft resolution embodied in A/C.1/60/L.28, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

However, we would like to place on record that we have not been satisfied with the draft resolution as it stands, because we feel that the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki inflicted heavy losses on the Japanese population, and the death-dealing effects thereof continue to be reflected in the pain and devastation caused to the victims and their family members. We should have liked this draft resolution to highlight the problems endured by the victims of the nuclear bombing in the operative section calling on States to comply with their international responsibility to ensure that proper treatment be given to the victims and their family members still suffering from the consequences of the attacks. In this connection we should like to recall that States are duty-bound to guarantee respect for human rights and for international humanitarian law for the purpose of preserving the dignity and the value of the human person.

Mr. Roa (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to offer an explanation of vote after the vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/60/L.4 and A/C.1/60/L.28. Colombia wishes to state that we have just voted in favour of both drafts; however we would like to explain that, with regard to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), Colombia reiterates what it has said previously before this Committee with regard to draft resolutions presented in the past on both these agenda items.

In line with international law and our country's constitution, we can only be called upon to implement these Treaties from the time our country ratifies them. Over the last several years, we have addressed the issue with the Provisional Technical Secretariat for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) and before the Preparatory Commission dealing with subsidiary organs. We fully confirm our commitment to this Treaty and will continue to seek ways and means of overcoming the constitutional impediments to the Treaty's ratification. We appreciate the interest shown by a number of States in helping us overcome these constitutional impediments that have stood in the way of our ratifying the Treaty. We would like, indeed, to ratify it at the earliest possible date.

Our proposals for overcoming this problem continue to be discussed and studied in the context of the Preparatory Commission for the CTBTO and its subsidiary bodies, with the advice and counsel of the Provisional Technical Secretariat. We hope and expect that these discussions will soon lead to speedy resolution of the problem that Colombia has addressed in connection with ratification.

Mr. Prasad (India): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolution entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", as contained in document A/C.1/60/L.28.

India fully supports the basic intent of the draft resolution, the total elimination of nuclear weapons. We agree that the ultimate objective of States is general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control, as contained in the final document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We very much appreciate Japan's commitment to this goal. However, we find that the draft resolution incorporates elements that are not acceptable to us. We cannot, for instance, accept a call to join the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty as a non-nuclear-weapon State. Thus, while we agree with the basic objective of the draft resolution, that is, the global elimination of nuclear weapons, we are constrained to vote against the draft resolution.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We would like to speak in explanation of vote A/C.1/60/L.4, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". We wish to acknowledge the efforts of States of the New Agenda Coalition for their preparation this year of the text of the draft resolution on the question of nuclear disarmament that would be more acceptable to all States. The text was substantively reworked and shortened. We take note of its specifically positive dynamic. The draft resolution contains fundamentally important provisions that Russia shares. In particular, these refer to the importance of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the commitment to non-proliferation.

Nevertheless, we abstained in the vote. The first reason for that is the title of the draft resolution. The issue is raised here of an artificial acceleration of nuclear disarmament which does not take into account political, technical and financial restrictions. The Russian Federation is committed to its obligations under article 6 of the NPT. Moreover, we believe that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is possible only through a gradual, staged progress towards the ultimate goal, on the basis of a comprehensive approach, without artificially racing ahead, with the participation of all nuclear States and, naturally, in circumstances where strategic stability and compliance with the principle of equal security for all are retained.

The second reason for our abstention is found in the sixth preambular paragraph, which contains the words "lack of implementation of binding obligations and agreed steps toward nuclear disarmament". It is hard for us to agree with such an assessment of Russia's real, major and irreversible practical steps towards reducing nuclear weapons in accordance with existing commitments.

Mr. Atieh (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation has asked for the floor to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.28. Based on Syria's support for international efforts to implement nuclear disarmament, we supported the draft resolution, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons". However, we would like to express our reservations regarding what is stated here on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and, in particular, the tenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 8, because of the position we have voiced on several occasions concerning this Treaty. We believe that these provisions in fact are keeping the draft resolution from reaching its ultimate objective of nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Hashmi (Pakistan): I would like to present the explanation of vote of my delegation on the two draft resolutions adopted by the Committee. First, I will explain our position on the draft resolution entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", as contained in document A/C.1/60/L.4.

Last year, my delegation appreciated the efforts of the sponsors in revising the contents of the draft resolution to move its focus onto the importance of the objectives of nuclear disarmament. These are objectives that Pakistan has already supported. The removal of references on which we had reservations also enabled the Pakistan delegation last year to vote in favour of the resolution. However, the decision by the sponsors this year to name the countries outside the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the call for accession without conditions, including the references to the NPT final documents, have obliged my delegation to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole and have also obliged us to vote

against operative paragraph 4, which is in line with our clear position on the universalization of the NPT.

I would now like to present before the Committee our explanation of vote on the draft resolution entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", as contained in document A/C.1/60/L.28.

My delegation does not agree with several provisions of the draft resolution. It places inordinate emphasis on non-proliferation rather than on nuclear disarmament which, in our view, should be its central focus. This inordinate emphasis is indeed a reflection of a regression in this vital area. In accordance with our consistent position on the NPT, we cannot accept the call to accede to it as a non-nuclear-weapon State. Nor do we consider ourselves bound by any of the provisions that emanate from the NPT Review Conferences or other forums in which Pakistan is not represented.

While my delegation supports the objective of total elimination of nuclear weapons, it cannot agree to some of the suggested proposals that are both selective and unrealistic. Therefore, my delegation decided to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution rather than voting against it.

Mr. Carriedo (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): First let me clarify that when Spain delivered its explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.8, on the Treaty of Pelindaba, it believed that action would be taken on that draft resolution today. That not being the case, it is my assumption that there will be no need for us to repeat it when action is taken.

Now I should like to take the floor to offer an explanation of Spain's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.4, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". Spain is a State firmly committed to peace and to following through on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation commitments. Spain's view is that both concepts and objectives, disarmament and non-proliferation, are indivisibly intertwined, inasmuch as they mutually reinforce each other as we seek to attain a single, more extensive goal — international peace and security. In this sense, Spain has always pursued an absolutely responsible and balanced policy that has been consistent with its international and regional commitments in the security arena.

Further proof of that commitment to peace and nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation is my country's decision once again to join the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.28, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", which Spain has always supported in past sessions, because it considers that draft resolution to be balanced and conducive to achieving a global consensus.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.4, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", Spain wishes to pay tribute to the constructive efforts by the New Agenda Coalition, which led the draft resolution. The text is a step in the right direction, that is, towards the achievement of a more balanced and pragmatic text conducive to the achievement of a global consensus. However, Spain believes that the draft resolution still has room for improvement and that, in the context of its international and regional commitments in the area of security, it would not be opportune for Spain to reconsider its abstention on that draft resolution at this time.

Mr. Rivasseau (France) (*spoke in French*): My delegation is taking the floor to explain France's vote on resolution A/C.1/60/L.28, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

France has decided to support that draft resolution. By its vote, my country wished to express its support for the growing number of States that approach the question of nuclear disarmament with seriousness and in good faith, and which have supported the text proposed by Japan.

The structure and substance of the text of that draft resolution has been updated compared to last year's text. It is demanding. It raises certain fundamental problems. Of those, I shall mention two that are of particular importance for my country: irreversibility and transparency. France recalls that in the Council Common Position of 25 April 2005 relating to the 2005 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the European Union recognized the:

> "application of the principle of irreversibility to guide all measures in the field of nuclear disarmament and arms control, as a contribution

to the maintenance and reinforcement of international peace, security and stability, taking these conditions into account".

That Common Position of the European Union also promoted "pursuing efforts to secure transparency, as a voluntary confidence-building measure to support further progress in disarmament".

Our vote today in favour of the draft resolution does not imply that we renounce that Common Position, which remains the reference point for France's engagements in those two areas. We hope that in the future our position will be better taken into account.

France also recalls that the nuclear deterrence remains an essential foundation of its security and that the question of nuclear disarmament, in conformity with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, is part of the framework for general and complete disarmament. That issue cannot be separated from the analysis of the conditions of international security and stability.

The Chairman: The Committee will move on to cluster 2, "Other Weapons of Mass Destruction".

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.51.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.51 is entitled "Measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee's 10th meeting, on 12 October.

The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.51 and A/C.1/60/INF.2. In addition, the following countries have now become sponsors of the draft resolution: Albania, Azerbaijan, Denmark, Estonia, Ireland, Italy, Kyrgyzstan and Serbia and Montenegro.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft resolution without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.51, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chairman: I now open the floor to delegations wishing to take the floor in explanation of vote after the vote.

Mr. Hashmi (Pakistan): My delegation supports the objectives of the draft resolution just adopted, contained in document A/C.1/60/L.51, although we continue to believe that the language of the draft resolution could have been improved to convey a more objective reflection of reality.

As the Committee would note, even in the case of the terrorist group Aum Shinrikyo in March 1995, the subsequent investigation established that, despite the considerable financial and technical resources and know-how of that organization, it met with logistic failure in its other plans — for the production of weapons of mass destruction.

We agree with the widely held view that the best guarantee against the threat of the possible use of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons lies in their total elimination.

There are other relevant issues in this whole debate, among which are serious concerns at the alarmingly slow pace of the destruction of weaponized chemical agents by the major possessor States. We continue to believe that, as long as those weapons continue to exist in such huge quantities, the possibility of their falling into terrorist hands also remains.

With respect to the Biological Weapons Convention, a compliance mechanism is still not in sight. We believe that a compliance mechanism that put implementation of the Biological Weapons Convention on the same footing as implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention would have promoted international peace and security and addressed the concerns expressed, for example, in the draft resolution just adopted.

Finally, the draft resolution quite appropriately mentions the Final Document of the Thirteenth Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries as having expressed itself on the issue of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism. My delegation would like to remind the Committee that, in the context of the issue of terrorism, the document also stresses the need to address the causes which sometimes lead to terrorism — causes that lie in suppression, injustice and deprivation.

The Chairman: The Committee will move to cluster 4, "Conventional weapons".

Mr. Freeman (United Kingdom): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union on draft decision A/C.1/60/L.55, entitled "International instrument to enable States to identify and trace, in a timely and reliable manner, illicit small arms and light weapons".

The European Union welcomes the hard work done by the Open-ended Working Group on marking and tracing under the chairmanship of Ambassador Thalmann. While supporting the decision to adopt the instrument, we must register our regret that no operational provisions on ammunition and peacekeeping operations were included, and that the instrument is not legally binding. It is, however, an important step in the implementation of the 2001 Programme of Action. In that sense, it represents a positive signal from the international community to those countries most affected by the scourge. If it is applied by States with the necessary political will, the content of the instrument will help to discourage, and thus reduce, illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons. We hope that it can be strengthened at further review meetings.

The European Union is strongly committed to promoting further discussion of the issue of ammunition, thus taking up the recommendations of the Chairman's procedural report. The European Union appeals to all Member States to support the adoption of the draft decision by consensus. The European Union would regret any break in consensus.

Miss Majali (Jordan): My delegation would like to add its name to the list of sponsors of draft decision A/C.1/60/L.55, entitled "International instrument to enable States to identify and trace, in a timely and reliable manner, illicit small arms and light weapons".

My delegation would like to do so because it believes that although the instrument is not legally binding, it is nevertheless a step in the right direction — a step that has been arrived at through positive and constructive work under the chairmanship of Ambassador Anton Thalmann, and that upheld a principle of our work — that of consensus.

In the light of that fact, my delegation decided to co-sponsor the draft decision.

Mrs. Ferrari (Saint Vincent and the Grenadines): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM).

CARICOM States wish to place on record their deep disappointment with regard to the outcome of the negotiations of the Open-ended Working Group and the recommendation placed before the Committee. CARICOM supports the Programme of Action adopted by the United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, but takes the view that that document is but the first step in the process of controlling the proliferation of small arms and light weapons. The Programme of Action is a political document that addresses only part of the problem. Compliance is voluntary, since it does not impose legal obligations on States. CARICOM States are strongly committed to the implementation of the Programme of Action, but believe that there is a need for further action to address gaps in existing policy implementation at all levels.

The failure of the Open-ended Working Group to reach consensus on a strong and substantial instrument is a cause for regret. Such failure was provoked by the obstructive tactics of a very few delegations, for reasons which are still unclear to the CARICOM States, since all States, large and small, would benefit from greater control over small arms and light weapons.

The uncontrolled spread and use of small arms and light weapons poses a dangerous threat to the national security, law-enforcement efforts and economic and social development of many of our small countries as, in spite of our best efforts, we continue to face the spread of illicit weapons throughout our territories, most often through the illegal diversion of such weapons.

The nexus between small arms and light weapons and other forms of criminal activity is therefore one of the most serious threats to security in our region. International action to enable States to identify and trace illicit small arms and light weapons remains a priority for CARICOM States. An inadequate instrument should not be the end of the process, but merely a starting point.

CARICOM believes that an effective, multilateral, legally binding international instrument on identifying and tracing illicit small arms, light weapons and ammunition would have made an important

contribution to existing national, bilateral and regional efforts to control the proliferation of small arms and light weapons, which so heavily taxes the human and financial resources of the region. Such an instrument should have been based on firm obligations so as to enable States to trace existing lines of supply of illegal weapons, prevent the creation of new lines of supply and prevent the diversion of weapons from the legal trade, thus providing effective controls to curtail the spread and use of small arms and light weapons.

Ms. Vatne (Norway): Norway would like to align itself with the views expressed in the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the European Union on draft decision A/C.1/60/L.55, entitled "International instrument to enable States to identify and trace, in a timely and reliable manner, illicit small arms and light weapons".

The Chairman: As no other delegation wishes to take the floor, I will now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of position before action is taken on the draft resolution.

Mr. Loedel (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): The States members of MERCOSUR — Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay — and associated States Bolivia, Chile, Columbia, Ecuador, Peru and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela would like to explain their position before action is taken on the draft decision. The following countries also fully associate themselves with this statement: Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua and Panama.

During the meetings of the Open-ended Working Group to Negotiate an International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons, our subregion expressed its unequivocal preference for a legally binding instrument whose scope would include not only small arms and light weapons, but also ammunition.

MERCOSUR and associated countries take the view that the negotiations to arrive at such an instrument afforded a unique opportunity to send a clear signal with regard to the determination of the United Nations to confront the serious problem posed by the illicit trade in such weapons.

From the start of negotiations, MERCOSUR and associated countries interpreted the United Nations Programme of Action as a road map that recommended certain measures and provisions for adoption at the national, regional and global levels. That instrument, in its section IV, reflects the consensus achieved in 2001 as to the need to keep moving forward with regard to the adoption of instruments to deal with specific subjects that may contribute to the Programme's implementation, including marking, tracing and illicit brokering.

Our countries' view was that we must take advantage of the political momentum offered by the establishment of the first Open-ended Working Group mandated to negotiate a new agreement on the basis of the Programme of Action, while at the same time expressing a strong and clear-cut commitment on the part of the international community to adopting tough instruments against the proliferation of and illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons.

In that context, MERCOSUR and associated countries always had in mind that such a step would set a precedent fundamental to future progress in the framework of the United Nations, not only in the field of the illicit trade of small arms and light weapons but also on their transfer.

In particular, all our countries would have preferred Member States to acknowledge the need to deal with this issue in a comprehensive manner by including an essential component of small arms and light weapons: ammunition.

In that context, MERCOSUR and associated countries, as well as those countries that endorse this statement, have acceded to international instruments such as Inter-American Convention against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and Other Related Materials. As its name indicates, that Convention has a broader scope, because it includes the issue of ammunition.

The fact that the recently negotiated instrument does not include a single reference to ammunition creates a worrisome gap that will limit the chances of the Programme of Action on Small Arms becoming an effective tool in the fight against the devastating effects of the illicit trafficking of small arms and light weapons.

Furthermore, that situation puts the Programme of Action in direct contradiction with recent international jurisprudence in the field, which usually treats ammunition as an integral part of the problem of

arms. That is the case of the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and, within our region, Inter-American Convention against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and Other Related Materials (CIFTA), which all MERCOSUR member and associated countries, as well as those countries that endorse this statement, have signed and ratified.

Our countries will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution, because that abstention conforms to our commitment to seek an effective, timely and legally binding international instrument, as well as with our efforts towards comprehensive and effective implementation of the agreement reached in last June's negotiations on marking and tracing, to which the countries of our region gave their consensus support. MERCOSUR and associated countries recognize that the provisions on how to undertake marking, the maintenance of registries and cooperation in tracing contained in the marking and tracing instrument are compatible with the obligations of our countries as States parties to CIFTA.

In that regard, our countries reaffirm their commitment to pursue the efforts necessary to conclude a legally binding international instrument that, in an effective, timely and reliable manner, deals with the issue of the marking and the tracing of ammunition, small arms and light weapons and their illicit brokering. Our countries call upon all States to join their efforts to achieve that goal. MERCOSUR, its associated States and those countries endorsing this statement call upon all States to fully implement the recommendations contained in the instrument.

To conclude, MERCOSUR, its associated countries and the countries listed at the start of this statement fully commit themselves to work towards implementation of paragraph 38 of the annex to the report of the Open-ended Working Group (A/60/88), with the aim of achieving a legally binding international instrument, in line with the express desire of almost all delegations throughout the work of the Working Group.

Mr. Mine (Japan): We ask for the Chairman's indulgence to allow us to make a general statement.

I would like to make some remarks regarding draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects", which was submitted by Japan, Colombia, South Africa and other sponsor countries.

I have learned that a separate vote has been requested on one part of the draft resolution. On that assumption, I would just like to say that it is deeply regrettable for the international community that a request was made to put a paragraph of this draft resolution to a separate vote. This draft resolution enjoyed consensus adoption in past years. It is Japan's strong belief that it should be adopted by consensus in order to ensure an active and steady implementation of the United Nations Programme of Action at all levels, which demonstrates a reliable approach to resolving problems related to small arms and light weapons.

The Chairman: A point of order has been raised by the representative of Mexico, on whom I call.

Mr. De Alba (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I am very sorry to have to use a point of order — and also to recall for the Committee what a point of order means. The speaker has to be interrupted at the moment that a point of order is raised. And this point of order is being made because the delegation of Japan, as a sponsor of the draft resolution, cannot make an explanation of vote or address the content of the draft resolution. Statements of a general nature have been concluded. We are now in the segment of explanations of vote before the vote.

The Chairman: The point raised by the Mexican delegation is that Japan, as a sponsor, is not entitled to make a general statement. The point is well taken. So, we will move on to the phase of taking action on the draft resolution.

Mr. Mine (Japan): I thought that we were still at the stage of general statements. At least I remember, a few minutes ago, I asked for your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, and you give me permission to revert to the general statement. Therefore, I was making a general statement with the decision and the guidance of the Chairman.

Mr. De Alba (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mr. Chairman, I believe that you were very clear when you stated that there were no more general statements to be made and invited delegations to move on to the stage of explanations of vote. It was at that time that

the representative of Uruguay took the floor and made an explanation of vote before the vote. The delegation of Mexico also requested the floor to make an explanation of vote before the vote. I do not think that there was any doubt that we had concluded the stage of general statements.

It is not the intention of Mexico to prevent any delegation from taking the floor. Mr. Chairman, if you allow the delegation of Japan to speak, after clarifying that it did not have the right to do so, Mexico will not oppose that decision.

The Chairman: The procedure is rather complicated. As delegations know, we have at least four stages. The first is that of general statement and the introduction of draft resolutions. Next are explanations of vote before the vote, voting and explanations of vote after the vote.

From now on, once we have concluded a phase and there is a speaker speaking in the next phase, I will not allow any delegation to speak under the previous phase.

The delegation of Japan has already started its statement. It can finish as a final exception.

Mr. Mine (Japan): With regard to the particular paragraph put to the vote, operative paragraph 2, I would like to remind all delegations that the paragraph calls upon all States to implement an international instrument on marking and tracing.

I am aware that there would be a kind of dissatisfaction among certain countries, especially vis-à-vis the nature of that instrument. However, in that connection, I would like to point out the following two points.

First, negotiations on the draft instrument were concluded by consensus in the working group last June; it was not through a vote. There was no objection against consensus adoption of the draft instrument.

Secondly, regardless of the nature of the instrument, the implementation of its contents is both possible and necessary.

Having said that, I hope that separate voting will never have a negative impact upon the 2006 review conference. I also hope that the draft resolution will be adopted by consensus. The review conference in 2006 will be a significant occasion for the international community with regard to tackling problems related to small arms and light weapons. Japan sincerely hopes that the international community will make every effort to ensure the success of the review conference, as mentioned in this year's draft resolution.

The Chairman: Japan's statement was the last exception to our agreed procedure. From now on there will be no backtracking. We are now in the second phase of our work, namely, explanations of position before the vote.

Mr. De Alba (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Before I explain the position of the delegation of Mexico with regard to paragraph 2 of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/60/L.57, in addition to expressing the support of the delegation of Mexico for the statement made a few moments ago by the representative of Uruguay, allow me very briefly to also place on record the great appreciation of the Government of Mexico for the efforts of Ambassador Thalmann to reach the best possible outcome in a negotiating process that, as has already been pointed out here, was indeed complex and often the subject of the imposition of the will of the minority over that of the majority. We acknowledge his personal qualities and the enormous effort he has made. Notwithstanding the fact that the result was not satisfactory to my country, I wish personally to commend his dedication.

I would like to say that Mexico will abstain in the voting on paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, concerning the illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects, because the paragraph does not make any reference to existing binding regional and international instruments on the marking and tracing of small arms and light weapons. Our country has always promoted the establishment and implementation of legally binding instruments.

As a State party to the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition, as well as to the Inter-American Convention against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and Other Related Materials, we are obliged to observe the highest standards on the marking and tracing of small arms and light weapons and on firearms. It is for that reason that we must not agree to the drafting of instruments that are not legally binding or agreed on the basis of standards employing least common denominators.

In the context of the process of consultations and negotiations on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, Mexico suggested including an appeal to States in paragraph 2 to implement all — and I emphasize all — relevant instruments, particularly those binding in nature, above and beyond what has been agreed recently. That suggestion reflected a de facto situation, namely, that there are other binding instruments at both the regional and international level that address this issue.

Unfortunately, the amendments proposed in that regard were not acceptable to the co-sponsors. That was despite the fact that the proposals did not seek to wrest any elements from the draft resolution — on the contrary, the intention was to strengthen the text. Worse yet, the reason given for rejecting Mexico's amendment was the impossibility of incorporating it due to the fact that Mexico itself could not guarantee that it would be accepted by every single Member State and that it would not imply reopening negotiations on the draft resolution — an irregular procedure indeed.

Allow me to reiterate that Mexico regrets that the co-sponsors were unable to acknowledge or reflect on the existence of other important instruments on this matter, especially given, in the short term, the preparatory process before us with regard to the 2006 review conference and, in the medium term, the negotiations on other binding instruments that we will have to agree on to address the problems associated with the illicit brokering of weapons, as well as, perhaps, the trade in weapons and, one would hope, the civilian possession of weapons or any other matter that may be proposed by a Member State to the First Committee.

Mexico also regrets that, through this draft resolution, we have not succeeded in making an overall substantive contribution to the preparatory process of the 2006 review conference. We hope that that preparatory process, which will begin in January 2006, will be carried out in a more constructive, inclusive and, of course, more ambitious atmosphere than that which has characterized the negotiating process on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

Mr. Freeman (United Kingdom): I should like to make a short comment regarding a point of order.

I heard what the Chairman said, as well as what was said by the representatives of Japan and Mexico. I do hope that, in applying the rules, we can actually be understanding of the fact that we can all sometimes miss the titling of when we are speaking — it is very easy to do; this is not always a terribly clear process we are engaged in. I therefore hope that, while also applying the rules, we can be reasonably humane and understanding towards each other. But we will be your good servants, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: So there will be exceptions to our procedure, from time to time, in a humane way? Let us see.

As there are no further requests for the floor at this stage, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/60/L.55.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/60/L.55, which is entitled "International instrument to enable States to identify and trace, in a timely and reliable manner, illicit small arms and light weapons" was introduced by the representative of Switzerland and the Committee's 11th meeting, held on 13 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.55 and A/C.1/60/INF/2. Albania, Azerbaijan and Denmark have also become sponsors of the draft decision.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, China, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg,

Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Draft decision A/C.1/60/L.55 was adopted by 145 votes to none, with 25 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57.

A recorded vote has been requested on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, as well as a separate recorded vote on its operative paragraph 2.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, which is entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects", was introduced by the representative of Japan at the Committee's 11th meeting, on 13 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in documents A/C.1/60/L.57 and A/C.1/60/INF/2. In addition, the following countries have now become sponsors of the draft resolution: Australia, Azerbaijan, the Bahamas, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, the Dominican Republic, Iraq, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Liechtenstein, Mali, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Suriname, Thailand and Turkey.

With the permission of the Chairman, I shall now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompanies draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects".

"Under the terms of operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, the General Assembly would, respectively, decide to establish a group of governmental experts appointed by the Secretary-General on the basis of equitable geographical representation, commencing after the review conference and no later than 2007, to consider further steps to enhance international cooperation in preventing, combating and eradicating illicit brokering in small arms and light weapons, in three sessions of one week's duration each, and to submit the report on the outcome of its study to the General Assembly at its sixty-second session, and request the Secretary-General to provide the group of governmental experts with any assistance and services that may be required for the discharge of its tasks.

"Provisions have been made under section IV (disarmament) of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 that would enable the Department for Disarmament Affairs to provide appropriate services to the three sessions of the group of governmental experts that will be established in accordance with operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007."

The Chairman: I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

Mr. Cynkin (United States of America): In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, my delegation wishes to reiterate its strongly held view that all delegations should have adequate notice of draft resolutions that generate oral statements with regard to resource implications, prior to their consideration on the floor. As we have all affirmed previously, our concern for the transparent management and funding of First Committee initiatives is paramount. We respectfully request that the oral statement read out by the Secretary be issued in writing. We also request a postponement of the vote, in order to study the technical aspects of the statement that has just been read out as well as to study the possible financial implications of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: The representative of the United States has made two requests. The first is that the oral statement be made available as soon as possible, which we can do. As soon as we receive the oral statement from the appropriate department, we shall make it available to any delegation on request. I take it that satisfies the first request of the representative of the United States.

The second request was to suspend the Committee's action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57. Are there any comments from the floor with regard to that request?

Mr. Mine (Japan): With regard to the point of order raised by the representative of the United States, I would like to ask for clarification about the request to postpone the Committee's taking of a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57. As I understand it, there have been cases in the past — including yesterday — when decisions on draft resolutions were taken after oral statements were made on behalf of the Secretariat indicating that there were no budgetary implications. In fact, I recall a certain draft resolution on which Japan, along with the United States, referred to budgetary implications.

In that connection we received an oral statement from the Secretariat. The procedure was not halted, nor was there a request to do so. An oral statement has been made in the current circumstance, but a request has been made to halt the process. I certainly stand to be corrected, but I do not see any difference between the two cases. I should therefore like clarification in that regard.

The Chairman: There is a distinction. Oral statements were read out in both cases — yesterday concerning the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research and today regarding draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57. The difference is that we did not have a request yesterday to postpone our decision, but today we do. Any request for postponement during the course of taking action will have precedence over the voting action. The point of order raised by the representative of the United States therefore has precedence over our taking action. Therefore, to my mind the difference is very clear. We must take that point of order into consideration.

I call on the representative of Sierra Leone.

Mr. Rowe (Sierra Leone): I feel that the First Committee is treading on the territory of the Fifth Committee on budgetary matters. Having said that, I wish to refer to rule 128 of the rules of procedure:

> "After the Chairman has announced the beginning of voting, no representative shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connection with the actual conduct of the voting."

The Chairman: Everything therefore boils down to the interpretation of the point of order raised by the representative of the United States. I shall reflect on that point.

I call on the representative of Mexico.

Mr. De Alba (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I think that the statement made by the representative of Sierra Leone is prescient. I believe the rules are very clear: the point raised by the representative of the United States was out of order because it did not refer to voting, but to programme budget implications.

I tried to be humane, as invited to do by the representative of the United Kingdom. I therefore chose not to make a motion. But I think that, for the good of the Committee, we must abide by the rules of procedure. As pointed out by the representative of Sierra Leone, the rule is very clear: once the voting process has begun, it can be interrupted only with regard to an issue pertaining to the voting itself.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of the United States.

Mr. Cynkin (United States of America): First of all, thank you once again, Mr. Chairman, for entertaining our point of order. I just wish to make a

couple of other technical points that may be helpful in clarifying the situation.

First, it is my understanding that the rules of procedure of the General Assembly allow for any delegation to request information about programme budget implications. We are not requesting such information, as we are interested in moving things along as efficiently as possible. My understanding is that there is a requirement that 48 hours must transpire after requests for information about programme budget implications are made by delegations before the Committee can take action. We are asking for something less than that. But we think one thing is very important, namely, the question of oral statements on programme budget implications.

I do not think that such oral statements are mentioned in the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. It is therefore difficult to address how they should be handled. I would therefore respectfully suggest that oral statements on programme budget implications be excluded, that, while this is the practice, they are not really appropriate at this time. Rather, we should focus on how we do our business most efficiently and effectively.

I thank the representative of Mexico for the reference to the need to behave in a humane manner towards each other. I agree completely. We certainly could have made our request at the beginning of the Committee's consideration of the cluster. If that is appropriate, we can do that in future instances. But it seems that for most delegations here, mine included, the most logical time to raise the flag to request such an intervention is just immediately after the delivery of an oral statement, because that is when delegations understand what we are asking for and why. If there are some rules of procedure that would overrule that, that is fine; I shall be happy to raise my point at a different time. It seems to me that, for the sake of clarity, and as oral statements on programme budget implications are not mentioned in the rules of procedure, the logical time to talk about them is immediately after they are delivered, and before action is taken.

We are in your hands, Mr. Chairman, with respect to whatever works most efficiently and effectively in this regard. Again, I hope that we can proceed to consider this request in the most expeditious manner possible.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of Cuba.

Mr. Requeijo Gual (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I shall be brief.

My delegation interprets the conduct of the voting in the same manner as the representatives of Mexico and Sierra Leone. I believe the rules of procedure are quite clear in that regard.

The Chairman: I once again call on the representative of Sierra Leone.

Mr. Rowe (Sierra Leone): I may be wrong, but I think the representative of the United States has acquiesced to my citation of rule 128 of the rules of procedure — that we are in the process of voting and that the voting cannot be interrupted, for the reasons stated in the first three lines of rule 128. I do not want to make a motion, but I leave it in the Chairman's capable hands that we should proceed with the voting on this cluster.

The Chairman: I call on Mr. Nobuyasu Abe, Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs.

Mr. Abe (Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs): It is not customary for someone from the Secretariat to intervene when Member States are commenting on procedure. But, as the representative of the United States has said, I think that we need to approach this question from a practical point of view.

When the provisional rules of procedure were adopted, soon after the establishment of the United Nations, there was no provision for the issuance of programme budget implications or oral statements on them. The fact is that Member States must bear the cost of any action by the General Assembly. Providing oral statements to Member States about programme budget implications — for example, that the taking of a given decision may entail millions of dollars in costs to Members — makes it possible for them to determine their positions on votes.

I therefore think that, practically speaking, it is to the benefit of all Member States to consider this question. In essence, either one provides oral statements beforehand in order that Member States can take informed decisions prior to the voting, or they may in practice be obliged to ask for deferral of action

until oral statements are actually made. I think that is the question facing the Committee.

The Chairman: I ask the Committee's indulgence while I consult with a member of the Office of Legal Affairs for a few minutes.

* * *

The Chairman: The point of order raised by the representative of the United States, concerning oral statements, has its merits as regards our consideration. We as a Committee must be transparent, and the Secretariat must make the oral statement available to all members as soon as we receive it from the budgetary authorities. There is no question in that regard.

With regard to the second point raised by the representative of the United States, namely, that we postpone the voting, precedent appears to side with rule 128 of the provisional rules of procedure. I have read the rule several times, and it seems to me crystal clear that, absent a point of order on the voting itself, once the voting procedure has begun it cannot be interrupted.

With all due respect to the arguments raised by the representative of the United States, we shall now resume the voting process.

I call on the representative of the United States.

Mr. Cynkin (United States of America): I approached the podium earlier to try to gain a sense of what members thought would be the appropriate time for me to make an intervention to ensure that the points could be made, and that they would not be in contravention of the rules of procedure. Perhaps the legal expert had not been consulted at that point, nor on the reference to rule 128. Acting in good faith, as I did, upon the advice given by those on the podium to make the intervention when I did, I am disappointed to hear the Chairman's ruling, but I understand it.

With due respect to the Chairman, having said that, I will not be able to participate in the voting as a consequence of that decision.

The Chairman: The points made by the representative of the United States are well taken.

I made this decision because I believed it to be correct under the rules of procedure. Moreover, in procedural terms, the oral statement made it clear that the draft resolution has no budgetary implications, so I concluded that we could take action on the draft resolution at this stage. But the points of the representative of the United States are well taken, and from now on, the statement will be made available to all delegations upon receipt from the budgetary department.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to continue the voting procedure.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now continue to vote on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, which reads as follows:

> "Calls upon all States to implement the International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa,

San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Jamaica, Mexico

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57 was retained by 162 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The Chairman: I should like to inform members that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution, as a whole, be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, as a whole, was adopted.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Ms. García (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela believes that the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons intensifies violent acts and impedes efforts in many countries to resolve conflicts and problems such as common crime, organized crime, drug trafficking and terrorism.

Our country is committed to multilateral efforts to combat those problems. We are implementing and support the measures set out in the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. We are a party to the Inter-American Convention against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and Other Related Materials and to the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.

Moreover, we support the implementation of the international instrument to enable states to identify and trace, in a timely and reliable manner, illicit small arms and light weapons, despite the fact that we would have preferred that it be legally binding. That is why we did not oppose the consensus regarding draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects".

However, we wish to express our reservations regarding the draft resolution's sixth preambular paragraph, which refers to the outcome document (resolution 60/1) of the 2005 world summit. We wish to recall that, when the outcome document was adopted, Venezuela's Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Ali Rodríguez Araque, expressed my country's reservations concerning all its contents because of the way in which the instrument had been negotiated and adopted. Subsequently, the President of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Mr. Hugo Chávez Frías, denounced the document as null, void and illegal since it had been adopted in violation of United Nations rules and had no validity for our country.

Therefore, the outcome document of the 2005 summit has the value of a mere working paper for our delegation. Its mention generates no responsibilities or obligations for the Republic because of the serious omissions that it reflects.

Ms. Miller (Jamaica): The delegation of Jamaica abstained in the voting on draft decision A/C.1/60/L.55, entitled "International instrument to enable States to identify and trace, in a timely and reliable manner, illicit small arms and light weapons". Our position in that regard is similar to the explanations offered earlier by the representative of Mexico and by the representative of Uruguay, on behalf of the Common Market of the South (MERCOSUR).

During the general debate, Jamaica expressed its strong reservations regarding the recommendation submitted to us by the Open-ended Working Group established to elaborate an international instrument on the marking and tracing of illicit small arms and light weapons. We are profoundly disappointed that the

Working Group did not produce a more substantive instrument that would have been legally binding.

Jamaica is committed to the prevention, combating and total elimination of the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons. We have been pursuing that objective through the implementation of relevant agreements, including the Inter-American Convention against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and Other Related Materials. Jamaica is also a party to the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.

While the provisions of the instrument just adopted are in keeping with the obligations assumed by Jamaica under it and other instruments, we are concerned that we have been asked to implement provisions that are weaker and less prescriptive, thereby diluting provisions already adopted within the framework of our national laws. By not imposing sufficiently strong obligations on producer countries with regard to marking and tracing, the instrument does not provide for the reinforcement needed to assist in our fight against the illicit trade in small arms. The instrument should also have included ammunition within its scope.

We believe that the non-binding nature of the instrument, and hence its voluntary application, will do little to stem the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons, thereby becoming ineffectual. We recognize that the steps taken to prevent, combat and eradicate the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons involve a collective responsibility on the part of all members of the international community. However, the main burden of that responsibility should fall on those States that produce small arms. A legally binding instrument would have assisted in that regard by strengthening the controls on transfers of such weapons.

Although we will implement the provisions of this instrument, we will continue to pursue the development of an internationally legally binding instrument to deal with the marking and tracing of small arms, light weapons and ammunition and with the illicit brokering of all such weapons.

Ms. Mangray (Guyana): I am taking the floor to offer an explanation of vote after the voting on draft decision A/C.1/60/L.55, on the marking and tracing of small arms and light weapons.

The international community has been faced with the destabilizing effects and security implications of the excessive accumulation and transfer of illicit small arms and light weapons, as my delegation has stated throughout the process that has resulted in a political instrument on marking and tracing.

Although we voted in favour of the decision, we are of the view that a legally binding instrument would have reflected a stronger global commitment, which is needed to curb the illicit traffic in small arms. As is well known, arms trafficking is linked to such activities as drug trafficking and terrorism, which has a direct impact on national security. Guyana and other countries in the Caribbean have been especially vulnerable to the armed violence generated by drug trafficking and other factors, as reflected in the statement made by the representative of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines on behalf of CARICOM. We therefore hope that the international instrument on marking and tracing will help in reducing those vulnerabilities.

My Government remains committed to working with the international community to eradicate the danger to human life and livelihoods represented by small arms and light weapons. In this regard, we certainly hope that any instrument to be negotiated in the future will be legal in nature. We look forward to the meetings next year on small arms and light weapons, and hope that they will enable the international community to move beyond set prescriptions and expedite the process of implementing all agreements relating to this issue.

Mr. Rivasseau (France) (*spoke in French*): I am taking the floor to explain our position on draft resolution A./C.1/60/L.57.

France supports the principle of consensus in the area of small arms and light weapons. Some delegations have expressed the fear that the adoption of a non-binding instrument on the marking and tracing of small arms and light weapons might set a bad precedent for their regions. However, by breaking with the consensus on the Programme of Action and on the issue of small arms for the first time in five years, those countries would be creating a much more dangerous precedent at the global level. We will not resign ourselves to that. We hope that those countries

will be able to return to the path of consensus on this issue. We call upon each of them to work in that direction.

Mr. Kucer (Slovakia): My delegation would like to request a correction to document A/C.1/60/INF/2, in which Slovakia is listed as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.57. Slovakia did not sponsor that draft resolution.

The Chairman: The Committee will move on to cluster 5, "Regional disarmament and security".

The Committee will proceed to take action of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.19. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.19 is entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement at the Committee's 14th meeting on 18 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/60/L.19.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.19 was adopted by 121 votes to 3, with 44 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now move on to cluster 6, "Other disarmament measures and international security".

I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to make statements or introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. Requeijo Gual (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to make a general statement.

Cuba reaffirms the need to preserve multilateralism in international relations, based on the principles of international law and the Charter. In that context, we reaffirm multilateralism as a basic principle, not just for negotiations in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation, but also for the resolution of any problems that might arise among States parties with regard to the fulfilment of commitments undertaken in the context of agreements in that field. Such consultation and negotiation processes must be carried out by means of internationally appropriate procedures, in the context

of the United Nations or of the mechanisms established by the treaties themselves, so as to preserve the collective security system enshrined in their constitutive charters.

Unfortunately, the hopes for peace, stability and cooperation in the world that the creation of the United Nations inspired are far from being realized. The current situation in the areas of disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation clearly reflects the crisis of multilateralism at the global level.

Cuba will continue to support, and to be directly involved in, negotiations in the context of existing major multilateral instruments and international organizations in the area of disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation. Those instruments, which rely on verification mechanisms that are non-discriminatory and are designed to foster consultation and cooperation among the parties with a view to resolving disputes, facilitate compliance with obligations and provide disincentives for any resort to unilateral measures that violate the principles of international law and the Charter.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I would like to introduce a revised draft resolution — A/C.1/60/L.30/Rev.1 — entitled "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities".

First of all, we are grateful to delegations for their support of the Russian draft resolution. During discussions in the First Committee, proposals were made for some small revisions to operative paragraph 1.

The purpose of that was to avoid potential ambiguities with regard to the fact that confidence-building measures in space could affect the legitimate interests of the users of spacecraft. We did not in any way mean to imply such an effect. However, in order to provide additional clarity vis-à-vis our intentions, we have agreed to the amendments considered desirable by our partners.

It is precisely to those ends that we put forth draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.30/Rev.1. The problem of ensuring security and safety in outer space, as well as the security of space objects in general, is becoming increasingly relevant. Efforts to promote transparency and build confidence in outer space can play an important and positive role. The United Nations already has vast and varied experience in this area. We call upon representatives to support our draft resolution.

The Chairman: As no delegation wishes to take the floor in explanation of position before the voting, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/60/L.13.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/60/L.13, which is entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 18 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/60/L.13.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft decision A/C.1/60/L.13 have expressed the wish that the draft decision be adopted by the Committee without a vote. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/60/L.13 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.14.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.14, which is entitled "Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement on Non-Aligned Countries, at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 18 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/60/L.14.

The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.14.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh,

Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Israel, Latvia, Micronesia (Federated States of), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.14 was adopted by 116 votes to 6, with 48 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.15.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.15, which is entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 18 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/60/L.15.

The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.15.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua,

Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.15 was adopted by 167 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The Chairman: I shall now call on representatives wishing to explain their positions after the voting.

Mr. Meyer (Canada): I have taken the floor on behalf of Australia, Canada and New Zealand to explain our abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.14.

We once again wish to express our disappointment that the draft resolution does not take into account concerns that we and others share. We have demonstrated firm and long-standing support for multilateralism across the diplomatic spectrum, and we agree that multilateralism is a core principle in non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament. We also believe it is useful to take advantage of opportunities to reinforce that view in appropriate forums. But although multilateralism is a core principle in our work, it is not, as the draft resolution suggests in its operative paragraphs 1 and 2, the sole core principle.

In our view, that language places other measures — plurilateral, regional, subregional, bilateral and, even, unilateral measures — in a lower tier of importance, even as their complementarity is noted in the eighth preambular paragraph. We consider that all those various measures can contribute to effective global non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament.

As we know from last year, we also have concerns about the way parts of the draft resolution are phrased. We should be describing an inclusive vision of multilateralism by finding language that will appeal to a wider range of parties. The sponsors might find that a more inclusive and comprehensive approach could enjoy wider support within this forum, thereby reinforcing the message they wish to convey.

We hope that there will be an opportunity for substantive discussions, possibly including informal consultations, should this draft resolution be presented again in future years.

Mr. Cynkin (United States of America): I have taken the floor to offer an explanation of our delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.15.

The United States previously made clear in the Committee the fact that it sees no direct connection between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control agreements. Frankly, we also remain unconvinced that this draft resolution is relevant to the work of the First Committee.

The United States believes that States parties to bilateral, regional or multilateral arms control and disarmament agreements should take relevant environmental concerns into account when implementing such agreements. The United States Government operates under stringent domestic environmental regulations, including in the implementation of arms control and disarmament agreements. Concern for the environment, however, should not lead us to overburden the critical negotiations phase of crafting an agreement. Such agreements are difficult enough to negotiate without having to take into account factors that are not relevant to their central purpose. In addition, it should not be the role of the United Nations to attempt to set standards for the content of arms control and disarmament agreements. It is up to the parties to such agreements to choose the provisions by which they are willing to be bound.

Draft resolutions on this subject have not changed in the course of the past five General Assembly sessions. That suggests to us that draft resolution

A/C.1/60/L.15 and its predecessors have not generated progress towards resolving the issues its sponsors wish to address. For that reason, and because of our continuing reservations about the appropriateness and utility of this draft resolution, the United States voted "no".

The Chairman: The Committee will now move on to the last cluster for today: cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery".

The floor is now open for delegations wishing to make general statements or to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. Cynkin (United States of America): I do wish to make a statement, but I would first raise a point of information. For the sake of clarification, is it now the ruling of the Chair that this would be the appropriate time for my delegation to request — as we have previously done along similar lines — that any oral statements regarding financial implications of any draft resolution in this cluster be submitted in advance for our consideration? Or is there a better or more appropriate time when I will not be out of order in making such a statement? I note that I would have to guess which draft resolutions to be considered will generate such statements, but I am willing to take that chance.

The Chairman: The voting process has not yet started, so I think the representative of the United States can proceed.

Mr. Cynkin (United States of America): I hope you understand, Mr. Chairman, that my remarks are in no way meant to demonstrate any disrespect for you or for the hardworking members of the Secretariat. They are directed only at the situation in which we find ourselves.

Under this cluster — although it has not been officially announced in any way — it is our expectation that draft resolutions A/C.1/60/L.18 and A/C.1/60/L.41 may generate oral statements regarding programme budget implications. In that connection, I wish to state again that my delegation wishes to reiterate its strongly held view that all delegations should have adequate notice of draft resolutions that generate oral statements with regard to resource implications, prior to their consideration on the floor.

To reiterate further, as we have all affirmed previously, our concern is for the transparent management and funding of First Committee initiatives. That is paramount. We therefore respectfully request that, should they be offered with regard to draft resolutions A/C.1/60/L.18 or A/C.1/60/L.41, oral statements be issued in writing. If that is the case, we also request that there be a postponement of the vote on those two draft resolutions, in order to enable members to study the technical aspects of the statement that would be read, as well as the possible financial implications of those draft resolutions, should they indeed produce oral statements.

The Chairman: The representative of the United States has requested that the Committee defer its action on draft resolutions A/C.1/60/L.18 and A/C.1/60/L.41. Are there any objections to that request?

That not being the case, the Committee will defer its action on those two draft resolutions. We shall therefore consider only draft decision A/C.1/60/L.17 at this time.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/60/L.17.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/60/L.17, which is entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 18 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/60/L.17.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft decision A/C.1/60/L.17 have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft decision without a vote. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/60/L.17 was adopted.

The Chairman: A number of delegations have asked for the floor, and I shall call on them now.

Mr. Freeman (United Kingdom): I simply wish to make a very short comment, if I may. I fully respect what the Chairman said on the question raised earlier with regard to oral statements on financial issues. But could I, just from the point of view of my delegation,

recall that it does seem to me, as a very practical person from a very practical country, that we are creating a rather daft situation, in which delegations now have to anticipate whether there will be oral statements. They have to anticipate what those oral statements say, but they must express their views in advance of their being presented. It seems to me an extraordinarily daft situation to have created.

I do not mean any disrespect to you, Mr. Chairman, for I know you do not wish to create it, but I do think that the legal advisers and others should perhaps reflect a little upon the sense of creating a situation in which this is going to continue to happen.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of the Russian Federation on a point of order.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I too would like briefly to share with the Committee my views on the situation regarding oral statements.

As we are all aware, at the Committee's next meeting we will consider draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.29, which was introduced by the Russian Federation and which is entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security". I know that an oral statement regarding the programme budget implications of that draft resolution has already been prepared.

I should like to ask the Secretariat to take an internal decision to settle this matter, as well as to speak to other interested delegations in order that relevant and timely information can be made available to all States before the consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.29, so that we do not face a situation similar to the one that has arisen in the Committee today.

Mr. Abdelaziz (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): The delegation of Egypt would like to express its gratitude for the Chairman's sincere dedication to adhere to the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, and especially with regard to strictly respecting rule 128. In that connection, the delegation of Egypt would like to take this opportunity to read out the succeeding rule, rule 129 of the rules of procedure:

(*spoke in English*)

> "A representative may move that parts of a proposal or of an amendment should be voted on separately. If objection is made to the request for division, the motion for division shall be voted upon. Permission to speak on the motion for division shall be given only to two speakers in favour and two speakers against" — and the most important part — "If the motion for division is carried, those parts of the proposal or of the amendment which are approved shall then be put to the vote as a whole. If all operative parts of the proposal or of the amendment have been rejected, the proposal or the amendment shall be considered to have been rejected as a whole."

(*spoke in Arabic*)

The delegation of Egypt would like to draw the Chairman's attention to that important rule so that all the rules of procedure may be adhered to strictly in our work in the future.

The Chairman: Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to inform the Committee that informal working paper 4, on our work for tomorrow, will be distributed shortly. I simply wish to make the point that we have only six or eight draft resolutions for consideration tomorrow. The following draft resolutions are now ready for action: A/C.1/60/L.8, A/C.1/60/L.30, A/C.1/60/L.34, A/C.1/60/L.49, A/C.1/60/L.16 and A/C.1/60/L.29 — as well as possibly A/C.1/60/L.18 and A/C.1/60/L.41, on which action was postponed at the request of the representative of the United States.

Unless any delegation has strong feelings about taking action on a given draft resolution tomorrow, I propose that we postpone tomorrow's meeting until the day after, Friday, 28 October, when there will be ample time to deal with other draft resolutions that maybe ready, in addition to the ones scheduled for action tomorrow.

Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to my proposal.

It was so decided.

The Chairman: The Committee's next meeting will therefore take place on Friday, 28 October.

Let me recall that, in addition to the draft resolutions I referred to a moment ago — A/C.1/60/L.8, A/C.1/60/L.30, A/C.1/60/L.34,

A/C.1/60/L.49, A/C.1/60/L.16 and A/C.1/60/L.29, plus A/C.1/60/L.18 and A/C.1/60/L.41 — we must still take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/60/L.22, A/C.1/60/L.62, A/C.1/60/L.38, A/C.1/60/L.33, A/C.1/60/L.37, A/C.1/60/L.56, A/C.1/60/L.1, A/C.1/60/L.35 and A/C.1/60/L.39.

Mr. Freeman (United Kingdom): Just for clarification, is what you have just read out, Mr. Chairman, everything we are going to take up on Friday, or everything that is left? I am not being difficult: I just think that otherwise we are going to be slightly confused as to what exactly we are doing on Friday and what we are doing on Monday.

The Chairman: The list I have read out is not exhaustive. There are still outstanding draft resolutions with which we must deal.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): In order to avoid questions on Friday, I should like to inform members that, as I already mentioned today, Russia's draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.30/Rev.1 will be ready for action on Friday. The Secretariat has informed us that the revised draft resolution will be issued either this evening or tomorrow morning. Delegations will therefore have sufficient time to review it in accordance with the 24-hour rule. We will therefore be able to act on it at Friday's meeting, as agreed.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.

United Nations A/C.1/60/PV.21

General Assembly
Sixtieth session

Official Records

First Committee
21st meeting
Friday, 28 October 2005, 3 p.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Choi Young-jin ..... (Republic of Korea)

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

Agenda items 85 to 105 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman: This afternoon the Committee will take action on draft resolutions listed in informal working paper number 4. That document refers to 17 draft resolutions, but requests have been made for the deferment of action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2 under cluster 1 and on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1* under cluster 6. Therefore, no action will be taken on those draft resolutions today and we will thus be taking action on only 15 of the draft resolutions.

The floor is open for those delegations wishing to make general statements or to introduce draft resolutions under cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons".

Mr. Sipangule (Zambia): I would like the record to reflect that Zambia's sponsorship of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.38 has been withdrawn.

Mr. Cynkin (United States of America): I would like briefly to express our delegation's appreciation to you, Sir, to the members of your staff and to the Secretariat for the flexibility and responsiveness shown in providing advance written copies of oral statements on draft resolutions having financial implications. We think that that will make a profound difference to our ability to carry out the work of the Committee, and we thank you very sincerely, Sir, for your efforts in that regard.

Mr. Kone (Mali) (*spoke in French*): Before the Committee takes a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.37/Rev.1, I should like, on behalf of the sponsors, to make a minor revision to the ninth preambular paragraph. The word "illicit" should be inserted before the phrase "small arms and light weapons".

I trust that the Secretariat will make the necessary change.

Mr. Lezona (Congo) (*spoke in French*): On behalf of the States of the Economic Community of Central African States, Congo expresses the wish that draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.41/Rev.1 can be submitted to the General Assembly for adoption.

Mr. Rowe (Sierra Leone): I just want to follow up on what was said by the representative of Mali about the ninth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.37/Rev.1. In addition to that representative's revision, footnote 4 should be placed after the words "In larger freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all", and should read "A/59/2005".

The Chairman: The floor is now open for explanations of vote or position before action is taken on draft resolution in cluster 1.

Mr. Carriedo (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): As today the First Committee will at last take a decision

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

05-57665 (F)

on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.8, entitled "African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty" — the Treaty of Pelindaba — the delegation of Spain would like to reiterate its appeal that the record reflect the fact that Spain's explanation of position on this draft resolution was made at the Committee's 20th meeting, on Wednesday, 26 October 2005. We did so then in the belief that that would be the meeting at which the Committee was to take action on the draft resolution.

In order to save the Committee's time, I shall limit myself to requesting that the Spanish delegation's full explanation of position made last Wednesday be reproduced in the record of that meeting. I have made copies of the statement available to the Secretariat and to all representatives.

Nevertheless, as we emphasized in our statements made following the consensus adoption in 1997, 1999, 2001 and 2003 of other draft resolutions on the matter, I wish to reiterate that we do not join the consensus in connection with paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.8, which is to be adopted without a vote today, for we continue to have serious reservations about the content of that paragraph.

Mr. Shamaa (Egypt): I wish to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22.

Egypt has supported the active involvement and engagement of the United Nations in addressing the issue of missiles since the introduction of the subject in the First Committee. That support for United Nations engagement stems from our strong belief that the United Nations is the appropriate forum in which to address this and all other issues related to questions of international peace and security.

Since receiving the first draft of The Hague Code of Conduct from the States members of the Missile Technology Control Regime, in 2000, we have expressed our position that there were serious shortcomings in the draft code that, regrettably, were not addressed in the final document. Those shortcomings relate to the areas of peaceful uses, cooperation and assistance. They relate also to the lack of comprehensive scope of the document, which addresses only the issue of the proliferation of missiles but not that of their development.

At the same time, the document addresses ballistic missiles but not other types of missiles, which have been the most common type in terms of use and proliferation, especially in recent decades. The document also ignores the most serious problem: that of the continued presence and development of nuclear weapons, of which ballistic missiles are but means of delivery.

In our view, The Hague Code of Conduct does not address the issue of missiles in a balanced manner, nor can it do so without structural adjustments to its text. We reaffirm the need for all interested United Nations Member States to be openly involved in all phases of discussion and in the adoption of relevant measures to deal effectively with the issue of missile proliferation in all its aspects.

In the light of the foregoing, we have joined other delegations in submitting amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22 that would ensure that the issue of missiles is dealt with in a comprehensive manner within the framework of the universal Organization, and in furtherance of a goal that we believe to be universal, namely disarmament and non-proliferation in all its aspects.

Mr. Cynkin (United States of America): I wanted to intervene to give an explanation of position with reference to draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.8.

The United States would like to support the statement made earlier by the representative of Spain concerning draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.8, on the Treaty of Pelindaba. The United States believes that Spain has a legitimate objection to being singled out in operative paragraph 3 of that draft resolution. Furthermore, the United States believes that Spain has a legitimate concern about the status of its national territory that the Treaty of Pelindaba defines as falling within its area of application. Those issues must be addressed.

Therefore, the United States strongly urges the concerned parties to quickly establish an effective process for resolving their differences with a view to finding a solution to these long-standing problems that takes into account the specific circumstances and the diversity of situations existing within the Treaty's area of application before a Pelindaba draft resolution is again considered by the First Committee. The effects of doing so would be beneficial for the Treaty of Pelindaba and for the African nuclear-weapon-free zone that it seeks to establish.

Mr. Gatan (Philippines): I would like to address document A/C.1/60/L.62**. In addition, on behalf of

the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22, I would like to request a recorded vote on that document.

The proposed amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22 contained in document A/C.1/60/L.62** were presented orally last year. This body decided not to accept them. The same amendments were introduced this year in writing, in the form of a document. That was a noticeable improvement that gave us time to reflect on the amendments. Nonetheless, it is an unusual practice that raises some doubts.

Dialogue is truly needed to breach possible conceptual gaps. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22 attempted to hold a dialogue. As Chair of The Hague Code of Conduct, the Philippines conveyed the sponsors' request for the withdrawal of document A/C.1/60/L.62** with the assurance that the Philippines, as Chair, would raise the concerns articulated in that document at the next plenary meeting of the Code's subscribing States. The Hague Code of Conduct Chair was not given any mandate to enter into negotiations on a text already approved by subscribers to the Code in plenary meeting.

Notwithstanding the inability of the proponents of document A/C.1/60/L.62** to agree to our request, the Philippines will bring their proposals to the next plenary meeting of the Code. However, in the context of the present meeting of the First Committee, we are unable to consider their proposals positively. We regret that we will vote against document A/C.1/60/L.62**, and we invite other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22 to consider doing the same.

Mr. Labbé (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of Chile wishes to support the statement just made by the representative of the Philippines in his capacity as Chair of the International Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation.

My country, like the other subscribers to the Code, has always been open to dialogue with States non-parties and has always expressed its readiness to consider all proposals that can improve the Code's effectiveness in an atmosphere of cooperation and mutual respect. We recall that last year, when we held the chairmanship of the Code of Conduct, we did not accept the proposals submitted by two countries because they were introduced orally and only moments before the voting. We appreciate the fact that this time they were formalized in writing, but we regret that their submission was not at least announced before the meeting of the Code's subscriber States, held in Vienna in June. That would have enabled us to study and discuss them as necessary and would have enabled the Philippines to come to the present session with a mandate regarding them.

We also regret that the sponsors of the proposed amendments contained in document A/C.1/60/L.62** were not able, in a spirit of dialogue and compromise, to defer their proposals to the 2006 General Assembly session and thereby give the Code's subscribers the opportunity to discuss and analyse their proposals at the next meeting of the contracting parties in June 2006.

For Chile, it is very important to prevent the Code from being politicized, because we know its objective is to help to increase transparency and confidence on the part of the international community and to combat the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their systems of delivery.

In view of those considerations, my delegation will vote against the proposed amendments contained in document A/C.1/60/L.62, although we are prepared to discuss and analyse them in Vienna next year. In that connection, we wish to invite all interested States to begin a dialogue that will permit greater awareness of the concerns and interests of all parties and that will make it possible to engage in joint efforts with a view to improving the Code of Conduct.

The Chairman: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of position.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.8. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.8, entitled "African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Nigeria on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.8 and A/C.1/60/INF/2/Add.1.

The Chairman: I should like to inform members that the sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.8 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22, entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation". Written amendments to the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/60/L.62**. A separate recorded vote has been requested on each of the three proposed amendments contained in document A/C.1/60/L.62**. There being no objection, I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Document A/C.1/60/L.62** was introduced by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, also on behalf of Egypt, Indonesia and Malaysia, at the Committee's 21st meeting, on 28 October 2005. The sponsors of the proposed amendments are listed in document A/C.1/60/L.62**. In addition, Kazakhstan and the Marshall Islands have become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22.

The Committee will now proceed to take a separate vote on the proposed amendment to the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22, contained in document A/C.1/60/L.62**, which reads as follows: "Add the words 'development and' before the word 'proliferation' and the words 'in a comprehensive manner' at the end of the paragraph".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Pakistan, Qatar, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Lebanon, Thailand, Yemen

The amendment was rejected by 105 votes to 26, with 7 abstentions.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on the proposed amendment to operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22, which reads as follows: "Add the word 'first' before the word 'practical'".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, China, Cuba, Egypt, El Salvador, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Malaysia, Mexico, Pakistan, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic,

Ecuador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Haiti, India, Lebanon, Mauritius, Thailand, Yemen

The amendment was rejected by 108 votes to 19, with 10 abstentions.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on the proposed amendment to operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22, which reads as follows: "Replace the words 'Encourages the exploration of' with the words 'Encourages the United Nations to explore'".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Pakistan, Qatar, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Lebanon, Thailand, Yemen

The amendment was rejected by 106 votes to 24, with 7 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22, entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation", was introduced by the representative of the Philippines at the Committee's 16th meeting, held on 20 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.22, A/C.1/60/INF/2* and A/C.1/60/INF/2/Add.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Abstaining:

Algeria, Cuba, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Pakistan, Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22 was adopted by 151 votes to 1, with 11 abstentions.

The Chairman: The floor is now open for statements in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Freeman (United Kingdom): I speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and all the countries that have aligned themselves with it, on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.8, entitled "African Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone Treaty". The EU attaches great importance to the development and strengthening, wherever possible, of internationally recognized nuclear-weapon-free zones, based on arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region.

Nuclear-weapon-free zones enhance regional and global peace and security and are a means to promote nuclear disarmament, stability and competence. We welcome and support the signature and ratification by the nuclear-weapon States of the relevant protocols of nuclear-weapon-free zones and look forward to the entry into force of the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty at an early date. The EU therefore welcomes the efforts undertaken this year in the First Committee to preserve consensus on the draft resolution and is satisfied that that was the case.

Nevertheless, as contemplated in the guidelines adopted by the Disarmament Commission at its 1999 substantive session on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned, every zone is the outcome of specific circumstances and must reflect the diversity of situations existing within it. Every nuclear-weapon-free zone must be a well defined geographical entity.

The European Union shares Spain's legitimate concern not to be singled out in the draft resolution. The Union calls upon the parties concerned to resume their efforts to find a solution acceptable to all of them that takes into account the specific circumstances and the diversity of situations existing within the area of application of the Treaty.

Mr. El Hadj Ali (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): My delegation would like to make a statement in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22. Combating the proliferation of delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction is undeniably a measure that contributes to attaining the objective of the disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. My country attaches particular importance to this issue and supports initiative to

promote the elimination of those weapons and their delivery systems. Also, we faithfully fulfil all our international obligations in that field.

My delegation was not able to vote in favour of the draft resolution entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation", contained in document A/C.1/60/L.22, because the draft resolution in question was not discussed with the other members of the General Assembly in a timely manner. Nor did the draft resolution take into account amendments proposed since the last session, which aimed to introduce the idea of vertical non-proliferation of ballistic missiles and underline the role of the United Nations in that process.

We believe that the comprehensive, balanced and non-discriminatory treatment of the issue of missiles requires going beyond the horizontal proliferation of missiles to include other, no less important vertical elements such as their design, development, testing and deployment.

In conclusion, my delegation believes that the United Nations remains the natural framework for negotiations on those issues and the adoption of instruments of such importance and that the Conference on Disarmament is the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum.

Mr. Hu Xiaodi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22, entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation". I would like to take this opportunity to explain China's position on this question.

China agrees with the non-proliferation objective of the Hague Code of Conduct and participated in the discussions on the draft Code. Since some of China's concerns were not resolved during those discussions, China has not subscribed to the Code of Conduct. However, China will continue to exchange views with all sides, including the Hague Code of Conduct participants, in our joint efforts to prevent the proliferation of ballistic missiles.

China has consistently supported non-proliferation and has advocated the elimination of weapons of mass destruction and the strengthening of relevant international non-proliferation efforts through broadbased dialogue and cooperation. We believe that the United Nations should play its full role in that process.

Mr. Gala López (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): As it did on a similar text last year, my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22. Our position is based on the following elements. In 2002, Cuba actively participated in two of the meetings devoted to negotiating the international Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation, when our delegation set out our main substantive and procedural difficulties.

The process of the adoption of the Code should not set a precedent for future negotiations in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation. There was a lack of transparency in the negotiations leading up to the Code's adoption. The process took place outside the framework of the United Nations, and it was noted that the main promoters of the initiative were not willing to allow any substantive changes to the text.

As a result of those conditions, the result of the negotiations was a political instrument that does not adequately reflect the main interests of a significant number of countries. For example, the Code does not address the question of the peaceful use of missile technology or the need for cooperation in that field in response to the specific interests of developing countries. At the same time, the Code's focus is limited to the horizontal aspect of proliferation, disregarding the vertical aspect. Nor does the Code address the need to achieve the goal of disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, given that the proliferation of ballistic missile capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction is only one part of the problem.

We therefore consider that The Hague Code of Conduct is an instrument that deals with the question of missile proliferation in a selective manner. That is contrary to the non-discriminatory, balanced and broad manner in which we have been addressing the issue of missiles in all its aspects in the framework of the General Assembly.

The technology of ballistic missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction is shared by a small number of States. Development and economic growth and vital progress in information and telecommunications technology are the common aspiration and goal of all countries, especially

developing countries. Promoting the economic development of countries should be the other side of the coin as we seek to put an end to the proliferation of ballistic missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction.

The transfer of technologies that benefit the peaceful development of countries must not be banned. What should be stopped is their use for military purposes. We reaffirm that economic and social development is not the exclusive right of only a few countries. Rather, it is the common patrimony of humankind.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have taken the floor to explain the position of my delegation with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22, entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation".

Like last year, my delegation was forced to vote against the draft resolution on The Hague Code of Conduct due to the fact that its sponsors were not ready to consider or discuss improvements to the text. The text of the draft resolution was drafted and submitted without consideration of the views of countries not subscribing to The Hague Code of Conduct. Those countries had presented amendments with the aim of improving the text, in order to give room to non-subscribing States with reservations on the substance of The Hague Code of Conduct and not to oppose the draft resolution as a whole.

The Hague Code of Conduct was drafted and endorsed outside the United Nations and without the participation of all interested countries. As has been stated, the aim of introducing a draft resolution at the United Nations should be to ensure the involvement of all Member States, including non-subscribing States to The Hague Code of Conduct. Unfortunately, the approach of carrying out discussions on this issue behind closed doors was continued, with States being asked to agree on the text of the draft resolution without any possibility for discussion. They were also being asked to agree on the text on a take-it-or-leave it basis. We hope that this policy will be reconsidered.

We are glad that, for the first time, informal consultations were organized — and albeit too late — by the Philippines, current Chair of The Hague Code of Conduct process. Certainly, expressing readiness to consider the proposed amendments to the draft resolution was a positive gesture. We hope that the same atmosphere will continue next year, and that thorough and positive interaction between States concerned will provide a text more acceptable to the General Assembly.

As has been stated, the Chair of The Hague Code of Conduct has promised substantive and positive consideration of the amendments presented to the General Assembly at the next plenary session of subscribing States to The Hague Code of Conduct. My delegation appreciates that and looks forward to engaging constructively in order to agree on a text more acceptable to the General Assembly.

Mr. Prasad (India): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/60/L.22, entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation".

India is fully committed to the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, including ballistic missiles. The proliferation of ballistic missiles in our region has had an adverse impact on India's security. We would like to underline the responsibility of States in preventing, combating and eliminating the proliferation of ballistic missiles. India believes that multilaterally negotiated and legally binding instruments provide the best mechanisms to deal with disarmament and non-proliferation issues, including the proliferation of ballistic missiles. An inclusive approach enables the international community to deal with issues in a comprehensive manner while securing the support of a large majority of States. India believes that a multilateral and inclusive process will be able to deal with the issue of the proliferation of ballistic missiles in a comprehensive way.

Mr. Percaya (Indonesia): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22. Like many other Members of the United Nations, my delegation recognizes the importance of the issue of ballistic missile proliferation and the need to address it immediately in today's international security environment. Given the complex nature of the problem, from the very beginning of deliberations on this particular issue my delegation affirmed its resolve to find a comprehensive solution to the problem. But such a solution will very much depend upon the ways and means we employ to approach it.

While recognizing that current mechanisms — more specifically, The Hague Code of Conduct — have contributed to international peace and security, my delegation believes The Hague Code of Conduct to be only a first practical step in that direction. Therefore, given the complex nature of the problem, it is our firm conviction that, as an international body responsible for maintaining international peace and security, the United Nations should be given a greater role in the process.

In our view, those elements were lacking in draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22, which we have just adopted. It is for that reason that Indonesia, along with other members, decided to propose amendments, set out in document A/C.1/60/L.62**, which the First Committee earlier failed to adopt. The proposed changes were intended to strengthen the draft resolution and to emphasize the importance of the United Nations in the process of establishing the International Code of Conduct, as well as to reflect current international realities.

My delegation also has some procedural concerns, such as the non-inclusive negotiating process. We are firmly convinced that the issue of missiles should, and probably will, be addressed within the United Nations system.

Because of its non-legally-binding nature, many members perceive The Hague Code of Conduct as a confidence-building measure, even though it is aimed at creating universal norms in the development, testing and deployment of ballistic missiles, particularly those that are capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction. If the proponents of The Hague Code of Conduct are serious about creating such universal norms, then the engagement and involvement of non-subscribing States are prerequisites to prevent the process from being regarded as non-inclusive and non-transparent.

Mr. Hashmi (Pakistan): I am taking the floor to explain our vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/60/L.22, entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation".

Pakistan shares the view that the issue of missiles remains complex. Proposals to address that matter continue to lack consensus. The inability of the last Panel of Governmental Experts to agree on a report only confirmed those realities. Pakistan therefore underlines the need to address the issue in all its aspects in a duly constituted multilateral forum, so that the views and concerns of all countries can be taken onboard.

We acknowledge that some efforts were made to accommodate the concerns of States. Given the ad hoc nature of the forum where The Hague Code of Conduct was negotiated and the lack of proper deliberations, the final product could not gain the support and acceptance of several missile-possessing States. Mine is a country that was obliged to respond to the missile threat introduced in our region, and The Hague Code of Conduct did not address our security concerns.

We note that, while the sponsors did indeed hold informal consultations to present the draft resolution — and we share the view that they were indeed late in doing so — the absence of any attempt to negotiate a generally acceptable text was also apparent this year. We also note that the sponsors continue to seem more interested in getting the draft resolution adopted than in promoting its objectives.

For the reasons I have outlined, my delegation abstained in the voting.

Mr. Atieh (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/60/L.22, entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation".

My country reaffirms its full commitment to the Charter of the United Nations and to multilateralism in the context of effectively implementing disarmament mechanisms aimed at eliminating weapons of mass destruction, foremost among which are nuclear weapons, as well as its commitment to adopting a clear approach to the control of nuclear weapons at all levels, while at the same time reserving the right to self-defence provided for under Article 51 of the Charter.

My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22 because The Hague Code of Conduct is selective and discriminatory. It focuses on one particular kind of weapon — ballistic missiles — and does not touch upon other groups of weapons, allowing them to be monopolized by one particular State. The Code considers the question of proliferation from one particular perspective, and thus fails to address the reasons for such proliferation. More

important, the Code runs counter to the multilateral approach of the United Nations.

The Committee should adopt a draft resolution addressing the issue of missiles in all its aspects in an inclusive manner, in the context of the United Nations, free from selectivity and discrimination. The approach of concluding an instrument outside the context of the United Nations and afterwards imposing it within the United Nations context greatly harms non-proliferation and disarmament mechanisms and encourages a retreat from the objectives of non-proliferation.

The Chairman: We will now move to cluster 2, "Other weapons of mass destruction".

We will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.33/Rev.1. I give the floor to the Secretary of the First Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the First Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.33/Rev.1 is entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Hungary at the Committee's 10th meeting, on 12 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/60/L.33/Rev.1.

There is an oral statement regarding the draft resolution, which, with the Chairman's permission, I shall now read out.

> "In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.33/Rev.1, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction", I wish, on behalf of the Secretary-General, to put on record the following statement of financial implications.
>
> "Under the terms of operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.33/Rev.1, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to continue to render the necessary assistance to the depositary Governments of the Convention, and to provide such services as may be required for the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the Review Conferences, including all necessary assistance to the annual meetings of the States parties and the meetings of experts and to render the necessary assistance, and to provide such services as may be required for the Sixth Review Conference and the preparations for it.
>
> "The States parties to the Convention, at the 9th plenary meeting of the Fifth Review Conference, on 15 November 2002, approved the cost estimates for servicing the annual meetings of States parties to the Convention of one-week's duration each year, commencing in 2003, until the Sixth Review Conference, and the two-week meetings of experts to prepare each meeting of States parties.
>
> "Similarly, it is expected that the States parties to Convention, at their annual meeting in December 2005, will approve the cost estimates prepared by the Secretariat for servicing the Sixth Review Conference and its Preparatory Committee. The costs of the Sixth Review Conference and its Preparatory Committee would be borne by the States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating in such meetings, in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessments, adjusted appropriately.
>
> "It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions and treaties that, under their respective legal arrangements, are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations may be undertaken by the Secretariat only when sufficient funding is received in advance from States parties. Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.33/Rev.1 would not give rise to any programme budget implications."

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.33/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: The floor is open for explanations of position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Ms. Paterson (United Kingdom): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and all those countries that have aligned themselves with it on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.33/Rev.1.

entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction".

The EU very much agrees about the importance of having achieved consensus on the draft resolution. The EU would like to take this opportunity to reiterate its commitment to the review process of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC), as provided for under article 12 of the Convention, as well as its support for all of the decisions of the Fifth Review Conference of the BTWC States parties, including that the 2006 Review Conference will consider the work of the meetings of States parties and meetings of experts and decide on any further action.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to cluster 3, "Outer space".

The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.30/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the First Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.30/Rev.1 is entitled "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at the 20th meeting, on 26 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/60/L.30/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Israel

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.30/Rev.1 was adopted by 158 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The Chairman: I give the floor to the representative of China, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Hu Xiaodi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.30/Rev.1, entitled "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities". Outer space is the common heritage of mankind. For years, the international community has made tireless efforts to prevent the weaponization of, and an arms race in, outer space. The draft resolution, sponsored by the Russian delegation can help attract greater attention to the issue of outer space from all sides. We appreciate and support such efforts.

At the same time, we believe that the best way to prevent the weaponization of, and an arms race in, outer space is to negotiate and conclude the relevant legal instruments. Our work to promote transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space should focus on that goal.

The Chairman: We turn next to cluster 4, "Conventional weapons". The floor is open for general statements.

Mr. Landman (Netherlands): I would like to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1, which is entitled "Addressing the negative humanitarian and development impact of the illicit manufacture, transfer and circulation of small arms and light weapons and their excessive accumulation".

By introducing this draft resolution, we aim to make the work of the First Committee more relevant. It is a one-time-only draft resolution. It is a draft resolution on a topical subject, namely, connecting the concept of the close interlinkage that exists between development, peace, security and human rights — framed earlier this year by world leaders — with the issue of small arms. The draft resolution is timely and topical. At the same time, it does not pre-empt the upcoming process leading up to the review conference. This has truly been a joint effort. We would like to thank the many delegations that actively contributed to the genesis of the draft resolution.

We had hoped for consensus on this important subject, taking into account the wide cross-regional support for it. We therefore regret that one country has asked for a recorded vote because it could not support our approach to this issue.

Mr. Gaia Lopez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like to make a general statement on the cluster entitled "Conventional weapons". In that regard, we would like to reiterate that we share the humanitarian concerns associated both with the illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects and with the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel landmines.

We also believe that the First Committee should seriously consider and adopt real measures to prevent certain countries from continuing to develop and use increasingly sophisticated and lethal conventional weapons that cause so-called collateral damage, which is a phrase used to conceal innocent victims.

Several draft resolutions have been introduced under this cluster to address illicit small arms and light weapons. We reiterate our support for the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, which was adopted in 2001, as well as our firm determination to honour the commitments it contains. We also believe that there should be no reinterpretation of the agreements entered into in 2001, nor should there be a distortion of the mandate of the 2006 Review Conference for the Programme of Action.

Ms. Majali (Jordan): My delegation would like to make a general statement on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1, which we support for the following reasons. First, my delegation agrees with the presenter and sponsors of the draft resolution that addressing the negative humanitarian and development impacts of the illicit trade, manufacture, transfer and circulation of small arms and light weapons in post-conflict situations is of utmost importance if peace, reconciliation, safety, security, stability and development are to prevail. Those impacts should therefore be addressed.

Secondly, my delegation notes that, as a starting point, the draft resolution reaffirms respect for, and commitment to, international law and the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, thereby clearly setting the stage for our work with respect to the areas we are expected to tackle.

Thirdly, as we have stated on a number of occasions during the work of the First Committee at this session — including during the open-ended round of consultations on preparations for the 2006 Review Conference on the United Nations Programme of Action on small arms and light weapons, and on the Review Conference itself, that were recently held by the Department for Disarmament Affairs — my delegation believes that while those gatherings should focus primarily on their stipulated mandate in evaluating the progress made to date and on determining what else needs to be done to fully implement the commitments undertaken in the Programme of Action as the basis for our work, they should nevertheless also provide an opportunity to address other relevant issues and needs in the future that may have added value in that regard, including humanitarian and developmental challenges, which are of great importance.

My delegation is aware of the importance that many countries emerging from conflict attach to addressing the negative humanitarian and development impact of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons and to the assistance and cooperation they will seek in that regard, which may be provided by the outcome of the 2006 review.

My delegation notes that the draft resolution reaffirms the urgent need for international cooperation and assistance to support and facilitate efforts to prevent, combat and eradicate the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects, as well as the fact that it calls upon States and appropriate international and regional organizations in a position to do so to seriously consider rendering such assistance.

Finally, my delegation is of the view that the new draft resolution introduced by the delegation of the Netherlands responds to a very important matter. We believe that delegation has worked towards consensus and has exerted genuine and constructive efforts to accommodate the concerns of all delegations as much as possible. We hope this exercise will set the tone for our future work for, and in, the 2006 preparatory and review conferences.

Mr. Rivasseau (France) (*spoke in French*): I am taking the floor in connection with draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.40/Rev.1, entitled "Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus".

The Secretariat has today made available that document, which contains the revised text of that draft resolution, which we would like to see the Committee adopt on Monday. I want, however, to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that, although we seek the broadest consensus, most satisfactory to all, we may still have to make some minor adjustments to the text before Monday, when action is scheduled. I understand that issuing a second revision could move the debate on the draft resolution to Tuesday or Wednesday. I would like, with the indulgence of my colleagues and friends here, to draw the Chairman's attention to the fact that we could distribute by facsimile, either this evening or over the weekend, a very lightly revised version of the text that could, if there are no objections, then be put before the Committee for approval on Monday morning, hopefully by consensus.

The Chairman: The representative of France has suggested that the Committee defer its action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.40/Rev.1 until next week.

Mr. Rivasseau (France) (*spoke in French*): Let me clarify. Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.40/Rev.1 was not scheduled for today. It was scheduled for Monday, so we are not asking that action on it be deferred; we are asking that it be adopted, as scheduled, on Monday.

We would simply point out that the text of L.40/Rev.1 that you are distributing will probably be very lightly amended by France on the floor Monday morning — if no one objects, of course — so that you will not have to issue a Rev.2 version and then defer its adoption until Wednesday. That is all. The goal is to enable us to adopt it on Monday instead of Wednesday. But if even one delegation has even the slightest problem with that, we would, of course, be prepared to wait until Wednesday, as is customary. Let me recall, however, that the rules of procedure also allow for the possibility of amendments made from the floor.

The Chairman: I give the floor to the representative of Azerbaijan, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. Mammadov (Azerbaijan): The delegation of the Republic of Azerbaijan would like to make a statement in explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56.

In past years, the Republic of Azerbaijan abstained in the voting on the draft resolution entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". The reason for that position was the impossibility of our country's signing the Ottawa Convention due to the conflict in and occupation of its territories. In addition, landmines are being used on the front line as a measure of deterrence and in order to prevent possible attacks and the resumption of hostilities.

However, the Republic of Azerbaijan supports the humanistic principles and aims of the Convention. In spite of the ongoing occupation of its territories, and taking into consideration the humanistic goals of the draft resolution, the Republic of Azerbaijan has considered the possibility of changing its position and will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1 is entitled "Addressing the negative humanitarian and development impact of the illicit manufacture, transfer and circulation of small arms and light weapons and their excessive accumulation".

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the 12th meeting, on 14 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1 and A/C.1/60/INF/2* and Add.1. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft: Andorra, Argentina, Austria, Bangladesh, Cyprus, Denmark, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Malta, Slovakia, Thailand, and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1 was adopted by 160 votes to 1.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.37/Rev.1.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.37/Rev.1 is entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mali, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations which are members of the Economic Community of West African States, at the Committee's 12th meeting on 14 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/60/L.37/1, A/C.1/60/INF/2 and Add.1. In addition, Chile, Colombia, the Comoros and Mauritania have become sponsors of the draft.

There is an oral statement to that draft resolution which, with the Chairman's permission, I shall now read.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.37/Rev.1, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them", I wish to put on record

the following statement of financial implications on behalf of the Secretary-General.

"By operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution L.37/Rev.1, the General Assembly would invite the Secretary-General and those States and organizations in a position to do so to continue to provide assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them. The related activities pursuant to the request would be financed from extra-budgetary resources. Therefore, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.37/Rev.1, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007."

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

May I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly?

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.37/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.49/Rev.1.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.49/Rev.1 is entitled "Prevention of the illicit transfer and unauthorized access to and use of man-portable air defence systems". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Australia at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 14 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.49/Rev.1, A/C.1/60/INF/2* and A/C.1/60/INF/2/Add.1. In addition, Andorra, Japan, Nicaragua and the Republic of Korea have become sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.49/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56 is entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Austria at the Committee's 11th meeting, on 13 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.56, A/C.1/60/INF.2 and A/C.1/60/INF.2/Add.1.

In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Afghanistan, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Malawi, Maldives, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Niger, Paraguay, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Seychelles, Somalia, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, Uganda, Ukraine, Vanuatu, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

There is an oral statement regarding the draft resolution, which, with the Chair's permission, I shall now read out.

> "In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56, entitled 'Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction', I wish to put on record the following statement of financial implications on behalf of the Secretary-General.
>
> "By operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General, in accordance with article 11, paragraph 2, of the Convention, to undertake preparations necessary to convene the next meeting of the States parties, pending a decision to be taken at the sixth meeting of the States parties, and on behalf of the States parties and in accordance with article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention, to invite States not parties to the Convention, as well as the United Nations, other relevant international organizations or institutions, regional organizations, the International Committee of the

Red Cross and relevant non-governmental organizations to attend the seventh meeting of the States parties as observers.

"In accordance with article 14 of the Convention, the costs of the next meeting of the States parties would be borne by the States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating in that meeting, in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessment, adjusted appropriately.

"The Secretariat will prepare the preliminary cost estimates for the next meeting for the approval of the States parties.

"It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties that, under their respective legal arrangements, are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations, may be undertaken by the Secretariat only when sufficient funding is received in advance from States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating in these activities. Accordingly, adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56 would not give rise to any programme budget implications."

The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Cuba, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Myanmar, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56 was adopted by 147 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

The Chairman: The floor is open for explanations of vote after the vote.

Mr. Hu Xiaodi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

This is the first time that China has voted in favour of such a draft resolution. China understands, and attaches importance to, the international community's humanitarian concerns about anti-personnel mines. The Ottawa Convention constitutes an important international initiative to address those concerns. China endorses the humanitarian purposes and objectives of the Convention. Although not a party to the Convention, China is willing to maintain

contacts and exchanges with the States parties to the Convention.

China has always been deeply concerned about the civilian casualties caused by the inappropriate use of anti-personnel mines and has made unremitting efforts in cooperation with the international community to address humanitarian concerns related to anti-personnel mines. In recent years, China has been engaged in various international demining cooperation and assistance efforts. In the future, we will continue to provide assistance to mine-affected countries to the extent of our ability.

Mr. Gala López (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56, which has just been adopted. As at previous sessions, the delegation of Cuba abstained in the vote on the draft resolution on implementation of the Ottawa Convention on anti-personnel mines.

I wish to make clear that my country, which is a State party to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, has always attached due importance and attention to the legitimate humanitarian concerns related to the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines.

However, for more than four decades, Cuba has been subjected to a policy of continuous hostility and aggression by the military super-Power. Consequently, Cuba cannot renounce the use of that type of weapon in order to preserve is sovereignty and territorial integrity, in accordance with the right of self-defence enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

We shall continue fully to support all efforts that, while maintaining the necessary balance between humanitarian and national security concerns, aim to eliminate the terrible effects on civilians in many countries caused by the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel landmines.

Mr. Prasad (India): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/60/L.56, regarding the implementation of the Mine Ban Convention.

India supports the vision of a world free of the threat of landmines and unexploded ordnance, where individuals and communities live safely and in an environment conducive to development, and where mine survivors are fully integrated into their societies. India's participation at the Nairobi Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention was reflective of India's commitment to that vision. It is to realize that vision that India has ratified the amended Protocol II to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and has adopted and implemented all measures necessary to adhere to the provisions contained therein.

In 1997, India discontinued the production of non-detectable anti-personnel mines and has observed a moratorium on their transfer. Furthermore, India remains fully committed to increased international cooperation and assistance for a mine-safe world, as well as to providing mine-related assistance under the United Nations umbrella. India is willing to contribute technical assistance and expertise for mine clearance and rehabilitation programmes in international demining efforts. India strongly supports technical cooperation in mine-clearance technology, equipment and training. India has set up a number of camps for the fitting of artificial limbs to landmine victims in Afghanistan.

India believes that a phased approach that addresses the legitimate defence requirements of States, especially those with long borders, would perhaps be more useful. We also believe that the goal of the complete elimination of anti-personnel mines will be facilitated by the availability of appropriate, militarily effective and non-lethal alternative technologies that can perform cost-effectively the legitimate defensive role of anti-personnel landmines.

Mr. Cynkin (United States of America): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1. The United States wishes to express its full support for the 2001 Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, as well as for the Review Conference to be held in New York in 2006.

However, despite its support for the Programme of Action, the United States opposed this draft resolution because it links efforts to curb and prevent the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons with the humanitarian and socio-economic consequences of the spread of illicit small arms and light weapons. Although the United States recognizes those issues, we do not believe that they should be raised in the First Committee, which is a forum solely for disarmament and international security issues.

Furthermore, the United States is concerned that the draft resolution pre-empts planning for the upcoming Review Conference on the Programme of Action. We believe that discussion of issues related to the Review Conference, including its agenda, should be left to the discretion of the Preparatory Committee in January. The delegation of the United States looks forward to working with all delegations on the shaping of the agenda for the upcoming Review Conference, so that it focuses on a review of States' efforts to implement the Programme of Action.

Mr. Tan Kok Yam (Singapore): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

Singapore's position on anti-personnel landmines has been clear and open. Singapore supports, and will continue to support, all initiatives against the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines, especially when they are directed at innocent and defenceless civilians. With that in mind, in May 1996, Singapore declared a two-year moratorium on the export of anti-personnel landmines without self-neutralizing mechanisms. In February 1998, Singapore expanded that moratorium to include all manner of anti-personnel landmines, not just those without self-neutralizing mechanisms. We also extended the moratorium indefinitely. At the same time, like several other countries, Singapore firmly believes that the legitimate security concerns and the right to self-defence of any State cannot be disregarded. A blanket ban on all types of anti-personnel landmines might therefore be counter-productive.

Singapore supports international efforts to resolve the humanitarian concerns over anti-personnel landmines. We will continue to work with members of the international community to find a durable and truly global solution.

Mr. Awad (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): The delegation of Egypt would like to explain its votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1 and A/C.1/60/L.56.

My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1, entitled "Addressing the negative humanitarian and development impact of the illicit manufacture, transfer and circulation of small arms and light weapons and their excessive accumulation", because it believes in the good intentions of the sponsors, who are attempting to discuss the illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons in the context of its humanitarian and development dimensions. We also supported the draft resolution because of our belief in the need to address the development and humanitarian aspects of the illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons in States emerging from conflict in a manner that conforms with the ongoing effort at the United Nations to develop the concept of peacebuilding in States emerging from conflict by establishing and operationalizing the Peacebuilding Commission.

As we all know, the majority of States emerging from conflict are located on the African continent. That has prompted us in Africa to pay special attention to strengthening the capacities of such States to address the illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects, as well as its impact on peace, security and stability. In that connection, the draft resolution's sole operative paragraph sets out a general framework to provide technical and material support to States emerging from conflict through a number of measures and guidelines.

We hope that the implementation of that framework in post-conflict countries will, with the assistance of the United Nations and the international community, contribute to curbing the negative humanitarian and development effects of the illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons. That hope is bolstered by the fact that the draft resolution reaffirms the need to respect and comply with international law and the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, including the principles underlying the United Nations Programme of Action: respect for State sovereignty; the right of all peoples to self-determination and to use any legitimate means at their disposal to realize that right; and the right of States to legitimate self-defence.

Those considerations helped us decide to vote in favour of the draft resolution after having participated in its elaboration, despite our reservations about some of its provisions, including the fact that it addresses issues, aspects, and formulations that lie outside the purview, work, and mandate of the First Committee, which is inconsistent with the Committee's original technical mandate to deal with the United Nations disarmament agenda.

Secondly, some have attempted to interpret the outcome document (resolution 60/1) of the September 2005 summit in a simplified manner, linking phrases, ideas and concepts to the mandates of various United Nations organs and Committees in a manner that weakens their capacity to implement their Charter mandates, despite the outcome document's emphasis on the links among development, security and human rights. That requires a non-selective approach. We emphasize the need for a clearly defined distinction between licit and illicit activities, which is an area governed exclusively by national legislation and rules. That applies to the relevant aspects of circulation, manufacturing and stockpiling, covered by the draft resolution just adopted.

Finally, our delegation emphasizes the need for joint action to ensure a successful 2006 Review Conference on the Programme of Action on the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. That requires a balanced approach to the Programme of Action to avoid creating an imbalance that could adversely affect our joint action and thereby undermine one of the most important and serious aspects of the disarmament agenda.

Our delegation would also like to explain its abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56, "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". We abstained because we believe that the Convention contains significant imbalances — an issue that we have raised repeatedly in the Assembly over the years. The Convention does not address the right of States to legitimate self-defence; nor does it balance the rights and obligations of States parties to the Convention. Moreover, it fails to address the issue of international cooperation with States that have suffered from the proliferation of mines on their territories or the need to provide such States with assistance in mine-clearance.

Mr. Bouchaara (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

Morocco is not a signatory to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, for imperative security reasons linked to the defence of its territorial integrity and to its legitimate national security interests.

This year, as at the previous session of the General Assembly, Morocco decided to vote in favour of the draft resolution on this subject. By confirming its positive vote, the Kingdom of Morocco wishes to reaffirm its support for and commitment to the humanitarian objectives and principles of the Ottawa Convention. In addition, our positive vote comes on the eve of the Sixth Meeting of States Parties, to be held in Zagreb from 28 November to 2 December 2005.

Here, Morocco would also like to reaffirm its commitment to supporting this review process. I wish to recall once again that Morocco has always implemented de facto many of the Ottawa Convention's provisions. Thus, the Kingdom of Morocco has never produced or exported anti-personnel mines. Moreover, well before the Convention's entry into force, Morocco no longer imported anti-personnel mines.

Finally, the Moroccan delegation wishes to recall that in 2002 the Kingdom ratified Amended Protocol II to the Convention on Conventional Weapons, relative to mines, booby-traps and other devices, considered by the international community to be an essential instrument in the field of humanitarian law. Our signature of Amended Protocol II is additional proof of my country's resolve to continue to contribute to the fight against the scourge of anti-personnel mines.

Mr. Lee Jang-keun (Republic of Korea): My delegation would like to explain its abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56, "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

As repeatedly stated and emphasized on previous occasions, the Republic of Korea fully shares and supports the spirit and the objectives of the Ottawa Convention. We have no doubt that that important Convention plays, and will continue to play, a central role in alleviating all human suffering caused by the irresponsible, indiscriminate of anti-personnel mines.

However, the unique security situation in our part of the world still does not allow us to adhere to the

Convention. That is the only reason that we abstain in the voting every year on the draft resolution on this theme. Yet we have joined the other instruments of anti-personnel-mine regulation, namely, the Convention on Conventional Weapons and its Amended Protocol II, under which we are actively participating in a range of discussions to ensure that mines are used responsibly, on the basis of a prudent balance between military necessities and humanitarian concerns.

Finally, my delegation would like to explain our national policy and practice with regard to anti-personnel mines. The Republic of Korea does not currently produce or export anti-personnel mines, and we are actively supporting international efforts aimed at mine clearance and victim assistance. The current Government is a regular contributor to the Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Clearance and is also assisting demining operations in Iraq through our contribution to the United Nations Development Group Iraq Trust Fund.

Mr. Shaimerdenov (Kazakhstan): I have requested the floor to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

Kazakhstan fully supports the objectives and the humanitarian nature of the Ottawa Convention and remains committed to the principle of a non-discriminatory, universal and global ban on anti-personnel landmines. Thus, Kazakhstan does not produce anti-personnel landmines and strictly observes the rules governing their stockpiling. Furthermore, the Government of Kazakhstan has banned the export and transit of landmines.

However, like many other countries, Kazakhstan believes that the issue of anti-personnel landmines involves not only humanitarian aspects but also the legitimate security requirements of Member States. Kazakhstan is prepared to become a party to the Ottawa Convention when the proper conditions are created. Since Kazakhstan is not a signatory to the Convention, my delegation has abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

Ms. Khyne (Myanmar): I should like to explain the position of my delegation on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/60/L.56, "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

Myanmar is, in principle, in favour of banning the export, transfer and indiscriminate use of anti-personnel mines. Although Myanmar is not a State party to the Ottawa Convention, my delegation respects the position of the States that are parties to the Convention.

However, Myanmar believes that all States have the right to self-defence, in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. Myanmar firmly believes that all States must possess the right of self-defence, as no State would compromise its national security and sovereign interests under any circumstances.

At the same time, we oppose the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel mines, which cause death and injury to innocent people all over the world. These tragedies occur due to the easy availability of landmines.

Based on the reality of the situation, a total ban would not lead to a practical or effective solution. Given these circumstances, we reiterate our belief that the Conference on Disarmament is the most appropriate forum to deal with the problem of illicit trafficking in, and the indiscriminate use of, anti-personnel mines.

My delegation therefore abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56.

Ms. Leong (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): Our delegation wishes to speak in explanation of vote with respect to the four draft resolutions we have just adopted.

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela supports and implements the measures set out in the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. For that reason, our delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1, entitled "Addressing the negative humanitarian and development impact of the illicit manufacture, transfer and circulation of small arms and light weapons and their excessive accumulation".

However, we wish to state that we are not satisfied with the draft resolution as worded, despite

the efforts made by the delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, in particular because of the references to "excessive accumulation" contained in the title as well as in the second and eighth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 1. Indeed, the draft resolution does not make clear what would be considered an "excessive accumulation". How would that be determined, and who would make such a determination?

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela believes that the reference to the excessive accumulation of small arms and light weapons does not prejudge or affect the legitimate sovereign right of every State to obtain, produce and stockpile such weapons in an amount that it considers appropriate to meet its self-defence and security needs.

We also support the efforts of the international community to help countries requiring such assistance to put an end to the illicit trade in such weapons.

For these reasons, my delegation has not opposed the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.37/Rev.1, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them".

However, we wish to place on record a reservation with regard to the eleventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, which refers to the final document of the 2005 world summit. We would reiterate that, at the time of the adoption of the resolution on that final document, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Venezuela, Mr. Ali Rodriguez Araque, placed on record a reservation with respect to our country's position on the contents of the document as a whole because of the manner in which it was negotiated and was being adopted. Subsequently, the President of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Mr. Hugo Chávez Frías, denounced the document as null and void and illegal, given that it was approved in violation of the norms of the United Nations and was therefore not valid for our country.

Consequently, our delegation considers that the so-called 2005 world summit outcome document is valid only as a working paper and that reference to it does not give rise to any obligation or mandate for the Republic, since we consider it null and void.

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela acceded to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction in December 1997. The Convention entered into force for our country on 1 October 1999, and we are in compliance with its provisions. Furthermore, Venezuela has for many years contributed to the mine-clearance process in Central America and fully supports efforts to achieve the goal of a world free of anti-personnel landmines.

For those reasons, our delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

However, we wish to place on record a reservation with respect to the eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, which refers to the 2005 world summit outcome document, for the reasons we have just mentioned.

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela recognizes the threat posed by the illicit traffic in Man-Portable Air Defence Systems (MANPADS) and the threat to civil aviation and to the maintenance of international peace and security. It supports measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring or obtaining access to such systems. For those reasons, my delegation did not oppose the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.49/Rev.1, entitled "Prevention of the illicit transfer and unauthorized access to and use of man-portable air defence systems". However, we wish to emphasize the legitimate sovereign right of States to acquire and possess such weapons to meet their legitimate self-defence and security needs, as recognized in the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

Mr. Hashmi (Pakistan): I am taking the floor to explain our vote on two draft resolutions — A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1 and A/C.1/60/L.56.

First, with respect to L.34/Rev.1, entitled "Addressing the negative humanitarian and development impact of the illicit manufacture, transfer and circulation of small arms and light weapons and their excessive accumulation", Pakistan reaffirms and shares the humanitarian and socio-economic concerns that may arise from the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. We also recognize the various challenges posed, especially to States emerging from conflict.

We appreciate the efforts made by the Netherlands delegation to incorporate suggestions and amendments. However, my delegation — and, indeed, many other delegations — pointed out during the informal consultations that, while the negative impact of the illicit manufacture and transfer of such weapons was understandable, Member States had yet to agree on a common understanding of what constituted the illicit transfer and manufacture of these small arms and light weapons.

Indeed, the proceedings leading to the consensus adoption of the United Nations Programme of Action in 2001 clearly reflected disagreement among Member States on these and other issues. We would therefore have preferred the draft resolution to have kept its focus on the negative impact arising from the agreed understanding of illicit trade rather than introducing elements which have yet to be agreed.

We look forward to the Preparatory Committee of the Review Conference in January and are prepared to discuss and develop a consensus on these and, indeed, on other issues in the context of the question of small arms and light weapons in all its aspects.

The issue of the illicit transfer and manufacture indeed requires further efforts to develop a consensus. We hope that our support for this draft resolution today is not construed as our agreement on these issues, which must be agreed by consensus among all Member States.

I should now like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56.

Pakistan's position on the question of anti-personnel landmines is well known. Given our security requirements and the need to guard our long borders, which are not protected by any natural obstacle, the use of landmines forms an important part of our self-defence strategy. As such, it is not possible for Pakistan to agree to the demands for the complete prohibition of anti-personnel landmines until viable alternatives are available. My delegation was therefore constrained to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution.

We are against the irresponsible use of landmines. It is indeed their irresponsible use that has caused so much destruction and misery. We remain committed to ensuring the highest standards of responsibility in the use of these defensive weapons.

Pakistan is a party to the Amended Protocol II of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, which regulates the use of landmines in both internal and external conflicts to prevent civilians from falling victim to landmines. We are continuing to implement the Protocol with the greatest earnestness.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): Russia abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56. We agree with the humanitarian objectives of the Ottawa Convention and, in principle, we do not reject the idea of acceding to it within a reasonable time frame. However, we can realistically do so only when we are certain that we can meet our obligations. To that end, we need to resolve some military, economic, technological and financial problems.

Mr. Kone (Mali) (*spoke in French*): My delegation welcomes the Committee's adoption without a vote of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.37/Rev.1, which shows that the question of small arms and light weapons remains an important aspect of general and complete disarmament.

Far from being a subject of interest only to West Africa or Africa alone, the issue of small arms and light weapons continues to occupy a central place in the concerns of the international community. Therefore my delegation would like to take this opportunity to thank, on behalf of the member States of the Economic Community of West African States, all those countries that were kind enough to support the draft resolution. We would like also to thank all those delegations that joined in the consensus on the draft. Finally, I should like to thank the members of the Secretariat for their ongoing availability and assistance.

Mr. Skrabalo (Croatia): Mr. Chairman, as my delegation is taking the floor for the first time during this session of the First Committee, allow me to congratulate you and the Bureau on your election.

I should like simply to place on record the fact that Croatia has co-sponsored the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1, entitled "Addressing the negative humanitarian and development impact of the illicit manufacture, transfer and circulation of small arms and light weapons and their excessive accumulation".

Mr. Gala López (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like to make a brief clarification with respect to

draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.37/Rev.1. My delegation's understanding is that it has been adopted and that the corrections made by the delegations of Sierra Leone and Mali will be incorporated in it. Is that also your understanding, Mr. Chairman?

The Chairman: My understanding is that the resolution has been adopted as orally revised.

The Committee will now move on to cluster 5, "Regional disarmament and security".

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.43/Rev.1.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.43/Rev.1 is entitled "Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa".

The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Congo at the Committee's 21st meeting, on 28 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/60/L.43/Rev.1.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft without a vote. If I hear no objection, may I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly?

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.43/Rev.2 was adopted

The Chairman: If no delegation wishes to speak in explanation of vote, the Committee will move on to cluster 6, "Other disarmament measures and international security".

Mr. Cynkin (United States of America): The Secretariat issued draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1 on "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements". But late yesterday, we discovered that this text differed in a number of important respects from the one that we had intended to have published. We have therefore faxed to all delegations a copy of the authoritative text for their consideration. We also have copies here, should any delegation wish to have one. Meanwhile, we drew those technical errors to the attention of the Secretariat, and A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1* was issued on 27 October. We understand that it required a particular effort to issue those corrections in so short a time, and my delegation appreciates the prompt assistance of Secretariat officials in rectifying matters.

However, there is still an omission in document A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1*. In the interests of efficiency I would like to read out the revision, rather than seeking yet another technical revision. The word "peace" should be added in the third preambular paragraph, so that the paragraph would end, "for regional and global peace, security and stability". Again, we have faxed to all delegations a copy of the authoritative text for consideration, and we have copies here that reflect that change.

Furthermore, we believe that delegations may need time to review the changes reflected in A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1* and to study the authoritative text. We have therefore asked for action on the draft resolution to be postponed until our next meeting, and we thank you, Mr. Chairman, for having accommodated us on that matter.

Mr. Rivasseau (France) (*spoke in French*): I would like to introduce a number of stylistic revisions to draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.39/Rev.1, entitled "Preventing the risk of radiological terrorism".

Consultations have continued over the past few days with a view to achieving consensus on the draft resolution. Some stylistic changes were suggested to us. Essentially, if not exclusively, we are citing word for word texts agreed by consensus. We communicated those changes to the sponsors by fax yesterday, and no problems were raised. We therefore propose to incorporate them today into the draft resolution.

Owing to the time required for the translation process, I understand that it will not be possible to issue a second revision until Monday, which means that we would not be able to take action until Tuesday. Since we are reluctant to keep delegations here for an additional day, we propose, if delegations agree, to take action on the text contained in document A/C.1/60/L.39/Rev.1 after it has been orally revised. The revisions were communicated to delegations at the beginning of the meeting.

In the tenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1, the words "in accordance with their national legal principles and consistent with international law" should be replaced with "in accordance with their national legal authorities and

legislation and consistent with international law", which is the language used in operative paragraph 10 of Security Council resolution 1540 (2004).

We want to ensure that the language used in operative paragraph 4 conforms with that contained the resolution of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and would therefore replace "calls on" with "urges" before the words "all States to work towards following the guidance contained in the International Atomic Energy Agency code of conduct on the safety and security of radioactive sources".

In conclusion, the following minor errors pointed out by the IAEA will also be corrected. In the sixth preambular paragraph, the words "national and legal regulatory infrastructure" should be replaced by "national, legal and regulatory infrastructure". In the eighth preambular paragraph, the capitalization of the revised action plan referred to should be as follows: "Action Plan for the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources".

Those are the revisions to the text that we propose, and it is the wish of the sponsors that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote.

The Chairman: The suggestion is that we defer action on A/C.1/60/L.39/Rev.2 until next week. Is that correct?

Mr. Rivasseau (France) (*spoke in French*): We are in the hands of the Committee. It seems to us that the changes to the text are purely stylistic. The language corresponds exactly to that used in the texts that we were asked to base ourselves on. We therefore believe that we are proceeding in accordance with the expressed wishes of all the delegations that were consulted. We therefore hope that the draft resolution can be adopted today. However, if any delegation has objections, we would, of course, be prepared to wait until Monday.

The Chairman: Action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.39/Rev.1, as orally revised, will therefore be taken today.

I will now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position before action is taken on the draft resolutions.

Mr. Prasad (India): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/60/L.39/Rev.1, entitled "Preventing the risk of radiological terrorism", as orally revised by the representative of France.

India is conscious of the threat posed by terrorists, especially the danger that terrorists may acquire and use weapons of mass destruction and radiological materials and sources. We therefore fully share the objective of preventing the risk of radiological terrorism and support international efforts to deny terrorists any opportunity to acquire and use radiological materials and sources.

India has been at the forefront of international efforts to combat the dangers posed by terrorists acquiring and using weapons of mass destruction. Since 2002, our delegation has submitted draft resolutions to the Committee on measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction. We believe that the draft resolution before the Committee on preventing the risk of radiological terrorism complements our draft resolution. We commend France and the other sponsors of the draft resolution for their initiative, to which we lend our support.

Mr. Freeman (United Kingdom): I am taking the floor solely on behalf of the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom is pleased to be able to support draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.16, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development". We welcome the mainstreaming of disarmament issues in development policy. This is particularly important in the field of conventional weapons, small arms and light weapons and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration. The United Kingdom does not believe that there is an automatic link between disarmament and development. Rather, a complex relationship exists between the two. Unfortunately, the draft resolution does not explain fully the complexity of the relationship.

As we said last year, we also have some reservations about the report of the Group of Governmental Experts. For example, we believe that the report did not give sufficient credit to unilateral, bilateral and multilateral actions in disarmament and non-proliferation.

However, despite those reservations, the United Kingdom's broader commitment to development goals, and our particular concern to combat the scourge of small arms and the impact they have on the lives of

people throughout the world, mean that we can continue to support the draft resolution this year.

Mr. Shaimerdenov (Kazakhstan) (*spoke in Russian*): I would like explain our vote on the draft resolution entitled "Preventing the risk of radiological terrorism", which is contained in document A/C.1/60/L.39/Rev.1. Kazakhstan actively supports Security Council resolution 1540 (2004) and signed the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism.

The Government of Kazakhstan is stepping up its measures to strengthen national systems aimed at the monitoring, control, transport and physical protection of nuclear materials. An example of our policy is our joint project with the United States on the safe transportation of fresh highly enriched fuel of the BN-350 reactor and its reprocessing into low-grade nuclear material. Detailed information about the project was provided in the statement made by Mr. Nursultan Nazarbaev, President of Kazakhstan, at the international symposium "Kazakhstan: Strengthening international cooperation for peace and security", held on 8 October 2005 in Ust-Kamenogorsk. The text of the statement is contained in document A/C.1/60/4. We believe that that project, together with Kazakhstan's national practices in the processing of highly enriched uranium into low-grade nuclear material, could serve as a model for the development of such projects in other countries. We intend to actively share our experience and have expressed our willingness to cooperate with other States with a view to the establishment of similar programmes.

On the basis of those considerations, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution on preventing the risk of radiological terrorism. We thank the sponsors for elaborating a draft resolution that addresses such an important and timely issue in the field of international security.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.16. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.16, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 18 October 2005. The sponsors are listed in the document.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania,

Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

France, Israel

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.16 was adopted by 154 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.29*. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.29* is entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at the Committee's 13th meeting, on 17 October 2005. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.29* and A/C.1/60/INF/2*.

There is an oral statement regarding the draft resolution, which, with the Chairman's permission, I shall now read out.

> "In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.29*, entitled 'Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security', I wish to put on record the following statement of financial implications on behalf of the Secretary-General.
>
> "By operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.29*, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of governmental experts to be established in 2009 on the basis of equitable geographical distribution, to continue to study existing and potential threats in the sphere of information security and possible cooperative measures to address them, as well as the concepts referred to in paragraph 2 above, and to submit a report on the results of this study to the General Assembly at its sixty-fifth session. It is envisaged that the group of governmental experts would hold one organizational session in Geneva in 2009 and three substantive sessions in New York in 2010. Therefore, there would be conference-servicing requirements for the four sessions of the group of experts. In addition, non-conference-servicing requirements would be needed to allow the Department for Disarmament Affairs to provide the necessary substantive services to the sessions of the group of governmental experts in 2009 and 2010.
>
> "Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.29*, the additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007. The requirements pertaining to the meetings of the group of governmental experts in 2009 and 2010 would be considered in the context of the proposed programme budgets for the bienniа 2008-2009 and 2010-2011, respectively."

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of

Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.29 was adopted by 165 votes to 1.*

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.35. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.35 is entitled "National legislation on transfer of arms, military equipment and dual-use goods and technology". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 14 October 2005. The sponsors are listed in the document.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.35 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.39/Rev.1, as orally revised. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.39/Rev.1 is entitled "Preventing the risk of radiological terrorism". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of France at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 18 October 2005. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.39/Rev.1 and A/C.1/60/INF/2* and Add.1. In addition, Canada, Chile, Congo, Guinea, Ireland, Israel, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro and Sweden have become sponsors.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.39/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted by 162 votes to none.

The Chairman: I shall now call on representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Cyzkin (United States of America): I would like to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/60/L.16 and A/C.1/60/L.29*.

First, with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.16, the United States has again voted against a draft resolution on the relationship between disarmament and development. Our delegation continues to believe that development and disarmament are two distinct issues that do not lend themselves to being linked. It was for that reason that the United States did not participate in the 1987 Conference on that matter. Accordingly, the United States does not, and will not, consider itself bound by the declaration in the Final Document of that Conference.

Draft resolutions like draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.29 have been under consideration by the First Committee for six years now. Member responses to the repeated requests for views during that period have not demonstrated any keen passion for seeking negotiated limits on the development and use of information technology. For the past two years, a Group of Governmental Experts has been meeting to explore further the merits of the subject. The United States supported the draft resolution on this issue throughout the previous General Assembly session, and participated in the Group of Governmental Experts in the hope that the focus might be redirected away from the futile and undesirable goal of circumscribing technology and towards the exploration of the promising contributions that many States could make with regard to the prevention of damage to national and global networked information systems and defensive networks, regardless of the origin of attack.

The stalemate within the Group of Governmental Experts regarding the attempt to itemize and limit existing and potential threats to information security underscored those differences. The United States had hoped this autumn to see a thoughtful redrafting of the draft resolution emphasizing areas of common ground. Instead, the new draft resolution acknowledges the Group of Governmental Experts, but not its failure, and seeks to cover the same ground. Moreover, the draft resolution seeks to advance the disputed case by calling for a global instrument and yet another group of governmental experts in the future.

While the United States welcomes one addition to the text — the clause calling for the identification of national efforts aimed at strengthening security and promoting international cooperation — it is insufficient to offset the remainder of the draft resolution. For those reasons, my delegation voted against the draft resolution.

Mr. Gala López (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to explain its position with respect to draft resolutions A/C.1/60/L.35 and L.39/Rev.1, as orally revised.

On draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.35, entitled "National legislation on transfer of arms, military equipment and dual-use goods and technology", which has just been adopted without a vote, my delegation reiterates that it falls within the framework of legally binding international treaties — treaties that have been negotiated multilaterally and that are universal in scope and non-discriminatory — capable of effectively guaranteeing strict international controls on the transfer of arms, military equipment and dual-use goods and technology.

The existence of export-control regimes based on selective and discriminatory criteria are in practice a serious obstacle to the implementation of the right of all States to use, for peaceful purposes, the various means and technologies that exist in the chemical, biological and nuclear areas. Cuba believes that the most effective model of export and import control would be one that was negotiated and applied in a true multilateral framework. Only broad and non-discriminatory participation in those controls can guarantee effectiveness in complying with the goals that have been set forth.

Multilateral efforts must be supplemented with measures adopted at the national level that strengthen commitments entered into by States in the context of the multilateral treaties on disarmament and non-proliferation to which they are parties.

Briefly, on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.39/Rev.1, as orally revised, which has just been adopted, my delegation would like to emphasize the need to prevent

the risk of radiological terrorism. My country supports the relevant efforts that have been carried out within the context of the United Nations and other relevant international organizations. We reaffirm the central role played by the International Atomic Energy Agency in promoting and strengthening the technological and physical security of radioactive sources and materials. International efforts under way in this field should be fully in keeping with international law and the principles of the Charter.

The Chairman: We still have to deal with cluster 7, but we have little time and will soon have to adjourn the meeting.

I would like to draw attention to informal working paper number 5, which has just been distributed and which lists only four draft resolutions. Therefore, including the two backlog draft resolutions from today, six draft resolutions remain to be considered on Monday. So we will have to decide whether to have a meeting on Monday or to consider those six draft resolutions on Tuesday together with the other two. I believe that the majority of delegations would want to have a meeting on Monday. That appears to be the case.

In connection with agenda item 116, a draft of the proposed programme of work and timetable for the next session is being circulated to delegations for their consideration.

I should also like to inform the Committee that the presentation of the 2005 United Nations Disarmament Fellowship Programme certificates will take place in this conference room immediately after our meeting, and I urge members to remain in the room to witness the presentation.

Finally, I wish to remind all delegations that next week, which is the final week of Ramadan, the hours of the plenary meetings of the General Assembly and the meetings of the Main Committees will be from 9.30 a.m. to 12.30 p.m. and from 2.30 to 5.30 p.m.

I wish all members a restful weekend.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.

United Nations A/C.1/60/PV.22

General Assembly
Sixtieth session

Official Records

First Committee
22nd meeting
Monday, 31 October 2005, 9.30 a.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Choi Young-jin ..... (Republic of Korea)

The meeting was called to order at 9.40 a.m.

Agenda items 85 to 105 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman: The Committee will first take action on the remaining two draft resolutions — A/C.1/60/L.18 and A/C.1/60/L.41 — contained in informal paper number 4, on which we were unable to take action last Friday due to time constraints. The Committee will then take action on the four draft resolutions contained in informal paper number 5.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to make a brief announcement.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): As in previous years, and as part of the ongoing efforts to improve conference services, the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management is again initiating a client survey exercise. This exercise will be covering all General Assembly committees, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, and the Security Council. As a result, the Conference Officers will be circulating a questionnaire to all delegations. I would therefore ask all Committee members most kindly to actively participate in this survey. The Conference Officers will collect the questionnaire at the end of today's meetings. If delegations would fill them out during the course of the morning, I would be most grateful.

The Chairman: We will begin with the two draft resolutions contained in cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery" — A/C.1/60/L.18 and A/C.1/60/L.41.

If no delegation wishes to make a general statement or to speak in explanation of vote, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.18.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.18 is entitled "United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 18 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.18 and A/C.1/60/INF/2*.

There is an oral statement to that draft resolution which, with the permission of the Chairman, I shall now read out.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.18, entitled "United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament", I wish to put on record the following statement of financial implications on behalf of the Secretary-General.

Under the terms of operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution L.18, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to provide all the necessary

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

05-60962 (E)

support, within existing resources, to regional centres in carrying out their programmes of activities. Implementation of that request would be carried out within the resources provided under section IV, "Disarmament", of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007.

The provision contained therein covers the three P-5 posts of Directors of the three regional centres for peace and disarmament. The programmes of activities of the three centres would continue to be financed from extra-budgetary resources. The attention of the Committee is drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.18, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft resolution without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.18 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.41, as orally revised by the representative of Nigeria.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.41 is entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa".

The draft resolution, as already amended, was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the Committee's 19th meeting, on 25 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document L.41. There is an oral statement to the draft resolution which, with the Chairman's permission, I shall now read.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.41, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa", I wish to put on record the following statement of financial implications on behalf of the Secretary-General.

Under the terms of operative paragraphs 1, 3 and 4 of draft resolution L.41, the General Assembly would, respectively, request the Secretary-General to establish, within existing resources, a consultative mechanism of interested States, in particular African States, for the reorganization of the Regional Centre and report to the General Assembly at its sixty-first session; request the Secretary-General to continue to provide the necessary support to the Regional Centre for better achievements and results; and also request the Secretary-General to facilitate close cooperation between the Regional Centre and the African Union, in particular in the areas of peace, security and development, and to continue to provide assistance towards stabilizing the financial situation of the Centre.

The implementation of the Centre, as contained in operative paragraph 1, would be carried out within the resources provided under section IV, "Disarmament", of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007. The consultative mechanism consists of informal meetings held as needed and aimed at discussing matters related to the revitalization of the Regional Centre. The meetings and their outcome would be reflected as part of the report that the Secretary-General is requested to submit to the General Assembly at its sixty-first session on the implementation of the draft resolution.

With regard to operative paragraph 3, the provision under section IV of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 covers, among other things, one P-5 post of Director of the Regional Centre at Lomé. The programme of activities of the Regional Centre would continue to be financed from extra-budgetary resources. The facilitation of cooperation between the Centre and the African Union and the provision of assistance towards stabilizing the financial situation of the Centre, as requested in operative paragraph 4, would also be carried out within the resources provided under section IV of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007.

The attention of the Committee is drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee is the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and also reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

Therefore, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.41, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. As I hear no objection, I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.41, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chairman: The floor is open to delegations wishing to explain their positions after the decision.

As there are no requests for the floor, the Committee will move on to informal paper No. 5, cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons", which contains one draft resolution, A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2. The floor is open to delegations wishing to make general statements.

Mr. Baeidi-Nejad (Islamic Republic of Iran): With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2, based on the request made by some delegations to add elements to the draft resolution so that they could support it, and based on the consultations held on the weekend, my delegation would like to offer an addition to the sixth preambular paragraph of L.38/Rev.2. The proposal has just been circulated in the Committee.

With that addition, the sixth preambular paragraph would read as follows:

> "Reaffirming the resolution on the Middle East adopted on 11 May 1995 by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty, in which the Conference reaffirmed the importance of the early realization of universal adherence to the Treaty and the placement of nuclear facilities under full-scope International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards".

We ask that delegations consider that new oral revision to draft resolution L.38/Rev.2.

Mr. Freeman (United Kingdom): Our Iranian colleague has just referred to a proposed new phrasing of the sixth preambular paragraph of their draft resolution. That, of course, is their business, and I respect that.

I just was not quite clear. He referred to conversations, or whatever, over the weekend, to which, as it happens, I was not party, so this is fresh language to my eyes. I wondered whether there would be time given for us to materially consider the proposal, because it is obviously a significant change, and I am not quite sure how much time we will have to consider it. I ask the Chair for his position on that.

The Chairman: I am not quite sure. We all know that tomorrow is the last day of this session of the First Committee. Is the representative of the United Kingdom suggesting that we defer taking action on this draft resolution until tomorrow?

Mr. Freeman (United Kingdom): I am not making a specific suggestion. I think Iran's suggested amendment obviously requires serious consideration. I think one owes Iran the courtesy of that. Equally, if one is to give it serious consideration, one needs a little time to think about it. I suppose one option would, indeed, be to wait until tomorrow to consider the whole thing. But I welcome your view on that, Sir.

The Chairman: As the Chairman of the First Committee, I have one philosophy: to serve the Committee's members. It will be up to Member States to take a decision on whether, collectively, we prefer to defer action on this draft resolution until tomorrow or try to force our action today, this morning. Any reactions from the floor?

Mr. Baeidi-Nejad (Islamic Republic of Iran): I thank the Ambassador of the United Kingdom for his suggestion — his comment, in fact.

Of course, as you mentioned, Sir, it is the custom of the Committee that we can orally amend draft resolutions and decide accordingly. But certainly we want to facilitate the decision by Member States and be respectful of their inclination to have further consultations.

One middle way could be to hold consultations while we take action on other draft resolutions. If by the end of this meeting we reach the conclusion that it would be better to postpone action on the draft resolution until tomorrow, we would certainly do it. But if we feel that positions would not change by tomorrow, we can take a decision today. So, with all respect, we can hold consultations until the end of this meeting and then take a decision.

Mr. Freeman (United Kingdom): I know, of course, our Iranian colleague very well. We deal with each other on a number of issues, and I have considerable respect and liking for him and recognize that he is being courteous, as he usually is.

I would be happy either with a suspension of the Committee's work for, say, 45 minutes, between votes, or for the draft resolution to be considered tomorrow. But I am afraid that I do not really think that, while voting continues, I would be able to have the kind of consultations I think I would need, because I would want to be here for the votes. So, if it is acceptable to Iran, I would happily go along with the idea of a suspension of the Committee's proceedings for, say, 45 minutes or an hour — whenever you, Sir, choose — or, if that is not possible for whatever reason, a delay.

The Chairman: Let us proceed this way: we will revisit this draft resolution at the end of today's session, and we will decide at that moment whether to take action on it or defer action until tomorrow.

Mr. Freeman (United Kingdom): I do not think I could even materially contribute to the discussion that you, Sir, have just suggested unless there has been an opportunity for a break in our proceedings. I do not know whether that was implicit in what you were saying, that you were thinking of an hour's break. If it is, then that is fine by me.

The Chairman: My suggestion is that we will all have some time to think it over while we deliberate on the other draft resolutions.

We will proceed with the next item. When we have addressed all the items today, we will revisit A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2 of cluster 1. Then, we will take a decision at that time.

So, the Committee will move on to draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.40/Rev.1, under cluster 4, "Conventional weapons". The floor is open for general statements and the introduction of the draft resolution.

Mr. Rivasseau (France) (*spoke in French*): I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman, but I asked for the floor before you moved on to the second item. I wish to introduce a number of small oral revisions that are essentially intended to improve the clarity of our text. With your permission, I shall read those out now.

The Chairman: You may proceed.

Mr. Rivasseau (France) (*spoke in French*): We have on our agenda today taking a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.40/Rev.1, entitled "Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus", which was presented by Germany and France. We have continued our consultations in the course of the last few days in order to ensure consensus on this draft resolution, for, as the Chairman is aware, we wish to have consensus on it. Some delegations expressed the wish not to change the substance of the text but to clarify a number of details that to them still seem somewhat unclear. We felt that all the suggestions made were useful, and so we propose that they be incorporated into the draft resolution.

Given the time required for translation and editing, I believe it will not be possible to publish a second revision without prolonging our work, perhaps until Wednesday. We hesitate to delay delegations until Wednesday, so we would like to make the following changes to Rev.1. With the approval of the Chairman, for which we are grateful, we distributed those changes to all delegations at the beginning of this meeting.

With regard to the preambular part of the draft resolution, we propose to delete the fifth paragraph entirely, as we have been told that it is not essential to the text.

We also propose merging operative paragraphs 1 and 2 so that it will be clearly understood that we are referring to the same thing in both paragraphs. That was indeed our intention, and it therefore seems a completely appropriate structural change to make.

Lastly, we propose a change to the former operative paragraph 5, now — with the merging of paragraphs 1 and 2 — operative paragraph 4. In that paragraph, the phrase "combat illicit trafficking in conventional ammunition", at the end, should be replaced with "to address accordingly the illicit trafficking related to the accumulation of such stockpiles".

Those are the amendments we propose. We believe that those changes will not only guarantee consensus, they will also ensure that delegations are comfortable with the text, as they cover the scope of the text, which is a modest one. The important thing for us to reach consensus on it.

The Chairman: As there are no other requests to make general statements on cluster 4, the floor is now open for explanations of vote before the voting.

Mrs. Martinic (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): The goal of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.40/Rev.1, as orally revised a few moments ago by the representative of France, is to address the issue of ammunition stockpiles in surplus and to take measures to prevent their illicit trafficking. The delegation of Argentina welcomes the introduction of that draft resolution, mindful of the need to act effectively to combat the proliferation of and trafficking in ammunition for conventional weapons, including small arms and light weapons. That is a priority matter for our country.

Argentina believes that firearms and their ammunition are not separate problems. We must adopt effective national measures to control them, both as regards their circulation and their transfer. Our position was made clear in the negotiations on the instrument on marking and tracing small arms and light weapons that emerged from the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects.

However, just as in 2001, the final document did not succeed in dealing with the issue in a comprehensive manner that included the subject of ammunition. Thus, in accordance with operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, the Chairman of the Open-ended Working Group recommended that the issue of ammunition be dealt with in a separate process within the United Nations. Argentina would nevertheless prefer that, when we review the marking and tracing instrument two years after its adoption, the matter of ammunition finally be included in the instrument without the need to initiate a new, separate negotiating process.

Although the draft resolution calls for the implementation of the proposal contained in paragraph 27 of the report submitted by the Chairman of the Working Group (*A/60/88*), it does not rule out establishing a process to address the issue of ammunition in a comprehensive manner that takes into account not just issues pertaining to marking and tracing but also matters having to do with transfers, brokering, the security of stockpiles and the destruction of surpluses. Pertinent in that regard is the report of the Group of Governmental Experts that assessed the feasibility of developing an instrument to address marking and tracing (*A/58/138*). Particularly relevant is paragraph 33 of the report, which acknowledges the linkage between arms and ammunition. Similarly pertinent with regard to the destruction of surplus ammunition is the report of the Secretary-General in which better methods for the destruction of arms, ammunition and explosives are proposed (*S/2000/1092*).

Argentina therefore believes that this initial draft resolution on the matter, which was introduced by the representative of France, will help us to keep the issue of ammunition on our agenda and may contribute to making Member States aware of its importance. The delegation of Argentina will therefore support the draft resolution, in order to underscore the need to comprehensively address the problems associated with small arms and light weapons by also addressing the issue of ammunition.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of the United States.

Ms. Sanders (United States of America): I would like to request that we postpone the vote on this draft resolution to later during today's meeting.

The Chairman: We shall delay action on this draft resolution to the end of the meeting, after we deal with draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2.

We shall now proceed to cluster 6, "Other disarmament measures and international security", which contains draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1*.

As there are no requests for the floor to make general statements, the floor is now open for explanations of position before the vote.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian Federation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1*, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements".

We are disappointed that the sponsors of the draft resolution did not take into account some of our

amendments and comments. As a result, the Russian Federation believes that, in contrast to a similar resolution adopted by consensus earlier by the General Assembly, the current draft resolution has lost its objectivity and its purpose, namely, to ensure the integrity of non-proliferation and disarmament agreements.

We fully share the view regarding the need to ensure compliance with agreements, especially in areas having to do with weapons of mass destruction and disarmament. That is one of Russia's guiding objectives in the fulfilment of its own obligations and in its efforts to ensure compliance by its partners. However, the draft resolution is replete with provisions that open the way for arbitrary interpretations that may not necessarily be in keeping with the goals of non-proliferation and disarmament.

We believe that claims of non-compliance that are not substantiated by facts are too serious to be formally recorded in a resolution of the General Assembly, for it is difficult to give credence to anonymous accusations. In our view, determinations of non-compliance should first be made in the context of the relevant disarmament and non-proliferation treaties, which is to say, by following the procedures they themselves have established.

We also have doubts about the concept of enforcing compliance, referred to in the seventh preambular paragraph. The substance of the call contained in operative paragraph 4 to hold non-complying States accountable is also unclear. Moreover, the parameters for such actions are not clearly described. In addition, that provision is linked not only to disarmament but to any other agreed obligation.

It should be noted that international practice covers many agreed obligations of varying nature that have different legal, political, military and technical implications. Each agreement has its own specificities, modalities and mechanisms for the determination of circumstances that may be interpreted as non-compliance. In our view, it is counterproductive to attempt to place everything under a single, amorphously defined heading.

As a result, instead of promoting greater discipline on the part of States regarding compliance with their obligations, a draft resolution such as this prefers to question the willingness of States to work towards international agreements in the future. We regret that the sponsors rejected the proposal to restore an operative provision regarding the need to guarantee compliance verification measures for disarmament agreements. We prefer that ideas pertaining to greater efficiency and strengthening of disarmament verification mechanisms not be left undefined.

We will not be able to support this draft resolution, although our position with regard to the strictest compliance by States with their non-proliferation and arms limitations obligations remains unchanged.

The Chairman: As no other speaker wishes to take the floor, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1*. A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1*, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements", was introduced by the representative of the United States of America at the Committee's 13th meeting, on 17 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1*, A/C.1/60/INF/2* and INF/2/Add.1. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors: Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1*.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte

d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Barbados, Belarus, Cuba, Egypt, Grenada, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1 was adopted by 137 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegation of Chile advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: The floor is now open for delegations wishing to explain their positions after the vote.

Mr. Baeidi-Nejad (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have taken the floor to explain the position of my delegation with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1*.

My delegation has supported the consensus resolution on compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements since 1985, when it was introduced to the General Assembly under the title "Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements". Based on its principled position, my delegation is of the strong belief that all States parties must comply on a non-discriminatory basis with all provisions of the relevant treaties. Iran believes that compliance with treaty obligations should be decided in strict observance of the provisions of the relevant treaties and by the competent international organizations. Non-compliance should, accordingly, be assessed and judged objectively in accordance with the principles enshrined in the respective international obligations.

Subjective and unilateral assessments of non-compliance and attempts to use such assessments for political and foreign policy leverage would only undermine the international and multilateral efforts to strengthen an effective global disarmament and non-proliferation regime.

The introduction of the recent resolution by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Board of Governors on the Iranian nuclear issue, in which reference is made to the non-compliance of my country with respect to its safeguards obligations, is a clear example in that respect. That reiteration is in clear contradiction of article XII C of the IAEA statute. Article XII C stipulates that "[t]he inspectors shall report any non-compliance to the Director General who shall thereupon transmit the report to the Board of Governors". Interestingly, however, in none of the IAEA Director General's reports on Iran — and I emphasize none, including the latest one, which was allegedly the basis of the resolution submitted to the Board — is reference made to Iran's non-compliance. Unfortunately, that element was introduced into the resolution subjectively and in contradiction to the IAEA statute.

In terms of the merit of the content of the draft resolution before the Committee, we are satisfied to see that, in its revised version, some of the Non-Aligned Movement's amendments were taken on board. In particular, the addition of the phrase "and other agreed obligations" in six relevant instances of the new draft,

which clearly includes the obligations agreed within the disarmament treaty review conferences, such as the Review Conferences of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, underscores that compliance with those obligations is as fundamental and essential as it is with the obligations enshrined in the legal instruments.

The addition to the concept of compliance as contributing to the prevention of the development of weapons of mass destruction is another new positive element of the new draft, which urges those States not currently in compliance with their obligations under article VI of the Treaty to revise their policies.

However, in contrast to the previous texts, which were adopted by the General Assembly by consensus, this year's draft resolution was introduced with drastic changes in the text. The statement made at the introduction of the draft resolution to the Committee strengthened suspicions when the United States delegation made it clear that it has no trust in the competent international organizations, such as the IAEA. The statement said that "there is no such thing as perfect verification" and stressed that international declarations, cooperative measures, on-site inspection regimes and even remote cameras and seals for continuous monitoring cannot satisfy the United States judgement of non-compliance. Overemphasizing the role of national technical means, in our view, is merely an attempt to undermine the multilateral verification system.

Unfortunately, some of the elements included in the text have been drafted ambiguously and lack clarity. For that reason, my delegation has opted to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution.

Mr. Hu Xiaodi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China has always believed that full compliance by States parties with arms limitation, disarmament and non-proliferation agreements is conducive to promoting international disarmament and non-proliferation efforts, thus enhancing international peace and security. China therefore agrees with the main thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1*, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements".

At the same time, we note that some very important elements and principles that were included in resolution 57/86, entitled "Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament and non-proliferation agreements" and adopted by consensus by the General Assembly in 2002, are not fully reflected in this year's draft resolution. We believe that those elements and principles remain valid and important in the current international situation and should therefore have been reaffirmed and upheld.

In light of those considerations, China did not participate in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1*.

Mr. Rachmianto (Indonesia): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1*.

We regret that there is a significant difference in the draft resolution as compared to resolution 57/86 in the way it addresses the issue of compliance with arms limitation, disarmament and non-proliferation agreements. While we recognize that some amendments have been accommodated by the sponsors of the draft resolution, my delegation remains unsatisfied, since there is still a lack of clarity in the text, particularly in the seventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4. For example, with regard to the issue of verification, we believe that it is closely related to the treaty regimes in that verification is part of the relevant provisions of those regimes.

Therefore, my delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution, in the understanding that compliance with nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation agreements alike should be addressed in a balanced manner and merits equal attention.

Mr. Prasad (India): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1*, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements".

India voted in favour of the draft resolution since it believes in the responsibility of States to fully comply with their obligations, as undertaken in various disarmament, non-proliferation and arms limitation agreements to which they are party. We would, however, like to place on record our understanding that States, in encouraging compliance by other States with the disarmament, non-proliferation and arms limitation agreements to which they are parties, shall act in accordance with the compliance mechanisms provided in the relevant agreements and in a manner consistent with the United Nations Charter and international law.

Similarly, they shall also resolve any issues relating to compliance by a State with its obligations in respect of the disarmament, non-proliferation and arms limitation agreements to which it is a party, in accordance with the compliance mechanisms provided in the relevant agreements and in a manner consistent with the United Nations Charter and international law. Furthermore, it is our understanding that the phrase "other agreed obligations" applies only to those obligations that have been undertaken by States with their sovereign consent.

Ms. Leong (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela is a State that respects laws and complies with the obligations that it assumes under international agreements. We are convinced that the observance of the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations is essential for international stability and security.

However, our delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1*, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements", because we were not satisfied with the manner in which it was written and because we regret that substantial changes were made to the consensus language agreed in resolution 57/86, adopted on 22 November 2002.

In that regard, we believe it relevant to point out that in compliance with agreements, there are times when commitments cannot be honoured as soon as one would like, sometimes because of a lack of financial or human resources or insufficient infrastructure and sometimes because of the priority accorded to other needs. However, such situations do not necessarily involve a risk to international stability and security.

We believe that the most appropriate way to promote the honouring of commitments is through cooperation, not through pressure or sanctions. We also wish to emphasize that selective approaches regarding the need to honour non-proliferation obligations must not be applied by those who themselves neglect to comply with their obligations in the field of nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Hashmi (Pakistan): I have taken the floor to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1*, on compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements.

Pakistan has consistently taken the position that States should adhere to the obligations of the treaties and agreements to which they are party. My delegation appreciates the fact that the United States included some proposals and amendments. Nonetheless, we would have preferred some of the important elements of consensus of resolution 57/86 to have been incorporated, such as support for the resolution of compliance questions within the provisions of relevant agreements and international law, as well as the role of the United Nations in restoring the integrity of and fostering negotiations on certain arms limitation, disarmament and non-proliferation agreements.

My delegation believes that compliance obligations apply only to States that have assumed them. We therefore would have appreciated it if, as in the preambular paragraphs, a more specific reference to States parties had been made in the operative paragraphs.

We are also convinced that, while verification, compliance and enforcement are integrally related, as the draft resolution states, we believe that those concepts are very much relevant and central to treaties and agreements; they do not have an independent existence.

Finally, my delegation feels that this draft resolution has distanced itself from the cooperative spirit that was a characteristic of its predecessor resolution. The new draft contains some elements that are, in our view, at variance with the spirit of the United Nations Charter.

For the reasons that I have outlined, my delegation abstained in the voting.

Mr. Rahman (Bangladesh): Bangladesh voted in favour of the draft resolution "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements", contained in document A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1*, because we support the spirit as well as the content of the draft resolution, as amended.

My delegation wishes, however, to place on record that in our pecking order, nuclear disarmament has priority over nuclear non-proliferation, although we believe that the two fit together and are complementary. We also continue to believe that the best guarantee against nuclear non-proliferation lies in the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Shamaa (Egypt): I should like to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1*, concerning compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements.

While Egypt attaches the utmost importance to the issue of compliance with non-discriminatory, multilaterally negotiated disarmament and non-proliferation agreements, I would like to point out shortcomings in the draft resolution.

First, it lacks one basic principle, namely, the indivisibility of compliance. By dropping that basic principle — which was previously agreed to and stated in operative paragraph 1 of resolution 57/86, urging all States parties to implement and comply with the entirety of all provisions of agreements to which they are party — this year's draft resolution allows for a very disturbing misinterpretation of the Law of Treaties: that it might be admissible for certain parties to forgo compliance with some of their treaty obligations, thus opening the way to selective application of compliance with a treaty.

Secondly, the draft resolution presupposes the non-compliance of what is described as "those States", urging them to make the strategic decision to come back into compliance with their obligations, while simple logic and the principles of law — whether national or international — require a legal sequencing of events. Thus, a call to return from a state of non-compliance must be preceded by a statement of non-compliance in accordance with the respective provisions of each treaty.

Thirdly, operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution raises a very serious concern by calling for Member States to take concerted action to encourage compliance by all States with their respective agreements and to hold accountable those not in compliance. That stipulation represents not only a major departure from the previously agreed text of resolution 57/86, but also, and more importantly, a departure from principles of international law. It calls on States not party to a treaty to take action towards compliance by States parties. In other words, it is calling on States non-parties to go even further than reviewing and assessing implementation by States parties of their respective treaty obligations. Here, let me recall that that notion gave rise to several objections when it was included in the context of another draft resolution submitted this year to the First Committee and that it was subsequently removed from the text because of its obvious contradiction with the principles of treaty law.

Finally, I would like to recall here what was stated by the representative of the United States when introducing draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1*. That representative rightly pointed out that States entrust their national security to regimes established by disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation treaties to which they become party, hence the imperative of verifying the compliance of other States parties with their treaty obligations.

Indeed, ensuring compliance with treaties is of paramount importance to States parties. However, achieving the universality of those treaties is even more important, since the gravest threat to the international disarmament and non-proliferation regime — and thus to the national security of States parties that have entrusted their security to those treaties — remains the non-adherence of States to the treaties establishing that regime, in particular what is described as its cornerstone: the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Thus, the lack of a clear call for those in a state of non-adherence to the disarmament and non-proliferation regime to take the strategic decision to adhere to those treaties with the aim of achieving its universality, and subsequently its goals, is a major weakness in the text of the draft resolution. Therefore, and while we attach the greatest importance to the issue of compliance, we abstained in the voting on the draft resolution in view of the points I have just mentioned.

Mr. Gala López (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1*.

As members will recall, in October 2002, several delegations raised concerns in this Committee about some of the changes made in draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.54, which was subsequently adopted as resolution 57/86. Indeed, my delegation made the point at that time that the draft resolution represented a step backwards with respect to resolution 52/30.

Today, my delegation wishes to place on record its dissatisfaction with the contents of draft resolution L.1/Rev.1*. Not only have a number of positive

elements of resolution 57/86 been eliminated, but controversial language has been included, further departing from the letter and spirit of resolution 52/30.

We have heard no convincing explanation of the drastic and regrettable changes in language in this year's draft resolution. The latest version of the draft continues to suffer from obvious inadequacies, amongst which I would single out the following.

First, by and large a selective, unbalanced and politicized approach has been adopted. Secondly, in the title and certain paragraphs, the order in which arms limitation, disarmament and non-proliferation are referred to has been changed, with the signal intention of highlighting the last element referred to. Thirdly, the phrase "States parties" appears less often. Fourthly, reference has been omitted to the concept of resolving compliance concerns by means consistent with agreements and international law. Fifthly, in addressing the issue of verification, the role played by the machinery and procedure laid out in those international agreements is sidestepped. Sixthly, the operative section in general contains controversial and ambiguous language that could give rise to arbitrary manipulation.

Cuba has always upheld the need to preserve and strengthen multilateralism and to guarantee strict observance of all arms limitation, disarmament and non-proliferation agreements. At the same time, we are convinced of the need for States parties to such agreements to meet, without resort to double standards, all their obligations under each and every article of the arms limitation, disarmament and non-proliferation agreements to which they are party.

It should be recalled that the chief author of draft resolution L.1/Rev.1* still possesses vast nuclear arsenals, although it has clear obligations with respect to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, including in the vertical dimension, as set forth in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. In turn, we stress the importance of ensuring that international agreements be endowed with relevant verification machinery designed to promote cooperation among their parties to resolve disputes, facilitate compliance with their obligations, and provide disincentives for recourse to unilateral measures that contravene the principles of international law and the United Nations Charter.

In that respect, we reaffirm the role to be played by the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, and reiterate that the most effective and sustainable way to strengthen the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction is through multilateral negotiations on a legally binding, international instrument that includes international verification measures, the opposition to which by the principal author of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1* is well known.

The Chairman: The Committee will proceed to cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery", which contains one draft resolution, contained in document A/C.1/60/L.21.

Mr. Rowe (Sierra Leone): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.59/Rev.1, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission".

It contains a new operative paragraph 5, which replaces the previous paragraphs 5 and 5 (bis) and all the square brackets in the original draft. The new operative paragraph 5 reads as follows:

> "Welcomes the efforts the Commission had made during its organizational meeting in July 2005 towards achieving its objectives, and recommends that the Commission intensify consultations on those efforts with a view to reaching definitive agreements before the start of its substantive session in 2006;".

In my statement during the interactive debate on disarmament machinery, I recalled an observation I made last July to the effect that the Disarmament Commission, having agreed on the texts of two agenda items and an issue for consideration next year, was reluctant to endorse those agreements. Regrettably, that reluctance manifested itself in the process of drafting a draft resolution on the report of the Commission for adoption by the First Committee.

As we are all aware, I have conducted intensive consultations over the past four weeks at the level of the bureau of the Commission with the representatives of the various regional groups and, individually, with a number of interested delegations that were kind enough to lend their support to my efforts. I also held two open-ended consultations. I must say, it was a tedious exercise.

Numerous delegations have expressed disappointment that the outcome document of the 2005 summit failed to address the important issue of disarmament and non-proliferation. However, we recall that that document, its omissions and weaknesses notwithstanding, was adopted without a vote. In our statements in the General Assembly and the First Committee, a large number of delegations moaned about the pitiful performance of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. Yet last week, in this very room, we adopted without a vote a draft resolution on the report of the Conference. That draft resolution — A/C.1/60/L.20 — inter alia, took note, in the sixth preambular paragraph, of what it described as "significant contributions made during the 2005 session to promote substantive discussions on issues on the agenda" of the Conference.

Draft resolution L.20 also took note of active discussions held on the programme of work during the 2005 session of the Conference, as duly reflected in the report and records of the plenary meetings. It also stressed the urgent need for the Conference to commence its substantive work at the beginning of its 2006 session, and went on to call upon the Conference to intensify consultations and explore possibilities with a view to reaching an agreement on a programme of work. It also welcomed — I emphasize "welcomed" — the decision of the Conference to request its current President and the incoming President to conduct consultations during the intersessional period. Those were some of the provisions of draft resolution L.20, which we adopted last week without a vote.

It is relevant to ask whether the performance of the Conference on Disarmament was better than that of the Disarmament Commission in 2005. One wonders why it was so difficult for us to come up with a similar draft resolution at least three weeks ago — one containing the facts, as duly reflected in the report and records of the Commission's July 2005 organizational meeting.

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.59/Rev.1, unfortunately, represents the least that the First Committee can recommend to the General Assembly. It should be read in conjunction with the report of the Commission. At the same time, I would like to suggest that, when we take action on it, we focus attention not so much on the letter, or words, of the draft as on the spirit, or content. All that the new operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution L.59/Rev.1 is saying is this: some groundwork was laid in the Commission's meeting in July 2005, so let us build on it, let us work harder during the next few months so that next year we will be in a better position to come up with specific, concrete and meaningful recommendations on problems of disarmament and non-proliferation. That is all — nothing more, nothing less.

Since draft resolution L.59/Rev.1 is a call not to legislate or to enforce, but to intensify deliberations, to talk and then make recommendations, and since its objective is also to reaffirm the mandate of the Disarmament Commission and underscore its viability and efficacy, I have no doubt whatsoever that the draft resolution will be adopted without a vote.

Ms. Sanders (United States of America): I would like to state for the record that the United States will not participate in the vote on a draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.21.

The Chairman: The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.21.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the First Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.21 is entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Argentina on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 18 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/60/L.21.

There is a oral statement to the draft resolution, which, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will now read out.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.21, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean", I wish to put on record the following statement of financial implications on behalf of the Secretary-General.

Under the terms of operative paragraph 9, of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to provide the Regional Centre with all necessary support, within existing resources,

so that it may carry out its programme of activities in accordance with its mandate.

The implementation of that request would be carried out within resources provided for under section 4, "Disarmament", of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007. The provision contained therein covers one P-5 post of Director of the Regional Centre at Lima. The programme of activities of the Regional Centre would continue to be financed from extrabudgetary resources.

The attention of the Committee is drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with the responsibility for administrative and budgetary matters, and reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.21, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. In the absence of objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.21 was adopted.

The Chairman: If no representative wishes to speak in explanation of position on the resolution just adopted, the Committee will turn to cluster I, "Nuclear weapons", which contains one draft resolution — A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2.

Mr. Freeman (United Kingdom): If it is the intention to move to put the draft resolution, as revised, to the vote, I do not require more time.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on the draft resolution, as orally revised. The floor is open to those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of position before action is taken.

Ms. Mtshali (South Africa): I am taking the floor to explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2.

South Africa recognizes the right of any State Member of the United Nations to submit draft resolutions for consideration in the General Assembly. In this context, South Africa considers its support for draft resolutions on the basis of the merits and content of each draft resolution and its consistency with South Africa's national policy on issues addressed therein. The origin of draft resolutions, therefore, does not determine whether we support them.

At the 2005 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), we lost the opportunity to make realistic progress on the most pertinent challenges facing the Treaty. We therefore need to continue to build upon previous undertakings and commitments, which placed us on an irreversible path towards the achievements of the purposes and objectives of the Treaty.

Nuclear weapons represent a continued risk to humanity. The longer nuclear weapons exist, the longer the world will have to wait to be free from the use or threat of use of such weapons. The case for non-proliferation rests on the primary objective of the NPT, which is to eliminate all nuclear weapons — hence the central importance of article VI of the Treaty. Nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament are therefore mutually reinforcing processes that will require continuous and irreversible progress on both fronts.

South Africa considered draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2 in the context of the failed outcome of the 2005 NPT Review Conference and our principled position on nuclear disarmament. As the draft resolution is not only in accordance with South Africa's national policy on nuclear disarmament but is also consistent with the position of the Non-Aligned Movement, South Africa will vote in favour of it.

Mr. Shamaa (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): The delegation of Egypt has decided to support draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2 on the basis of objective considerations, without taking into account other considerations. Egypt would have liked for the draft to include a reference within its operative paragraphs, to the need to achieve the universality of both the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards. Nevertheless, my delegation will join the consensus on the draft.

Mr. Rivasseau (France) (*spoke in French*): My country will align itself with the position of the European Union with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2. We believe that apart from the text's intrinsic value, we should also consider the context in which it has been introduced. We shall therefore vote against the draft resolution.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2, as orally revised by the representative of Iran.

A recorded vote has been requested, as well as a separate vote on the sixth preambular paragraph as orally amended.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2, entitled "Follow-up to nuclear disarmament obligations agreed in the 1995 and 2000 Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons", was introduced by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran at the Committee's 9th meeting, held on 11 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2 and A/C.1/60/INF/2*. In addition, Zimbabwe has withdrawn from co-sponsoring the draft resolution.

The Committee will now proceed to take a separate vote on the sixth preambular paragraph as orally revised by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

Mr. Freeman (United Kingdom): Our understanding had been that we would vote on the draft resolution as a whole. If in fact we are not voting on the draft resolution as amended as a whole, I would require a suspension of the meeting.

The Chairman: Is there any reaction from the floor? That not being the case, allow me to clarify the situation.

The representative of the United Kingdom originally requested action on this draft resolution provided action was on the draft resolution as a whole. Then there was a request for a separate vote on the sixth preambular paragraph as orally amended. The representative of the United Kingdom now has a problem with a separate vote. We therefore have a new situation.

I call on the representative of Iran.

Mr. Baeidi-Nejad (Islamic Republic of Iran): I indicated earlier that we certainly respected the position of delegations as regards requests for time to consider draft resolutions. However, in order to be consistent, as before when there was a request to suspend the voting process after the voting had begun in order to allow more time to consider drafts — if I recall correctly, that was two days ago — we suggest, as a sponsor of the draft resolution and with all due respect, that, given that the voting has already begun, we continue to vote, as required by the rules of procedure.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of the United Kingdom.

Mr. Freeman (United Kingdom): I am not trying to be difficult about this, but I do want to be clear about it. I had said earlier that I was considering the possibility of asking for a delay, as the Chairman has correctly recalled. Notwithstanding what the Chairman has just said, with all due respect, I did not make any indication on behalf of the United Kingdom as regards voting on the draft resolution as whole or not. I did not actually comment on that.

What I had established via the Secretariat — and I am afraid that I specifically asked about this — was that, if the draft resolution was being considered as whole, then I would have no wish for a delay. If it was not, and there was to be a separate vote on an element therein, I would. I made that very clear to the Secretariat before. With all due respect, the fact that the Secretariat proceeded down this road in that knowledge is either to ignore what I said or, candidly, to be incompetent. But it is one or the other.

The Chairman: Is there any reaction from the floor? I call on the representative of Sierra Leone.

Mr. Rowe (Sierra Leone): I heard the representative of the Secretariat say that we were going to vote separately on this draft resolution. I think we need some clarification here, whether the representative of the United Kingdom is opposed to the proposal to have a separate vote on the sixth preambular paragraph. If that representative is opposed to a split vote, then we must refer to the rules of procedure, to rule 129. I think. We need some

clarification on that. I do not know whether the representative of the United Kingdom is formally opposing the request for a separate vote. I think we should address that before we move on.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of the United Kingdom.

Mr. Freeman (United Kingdom): I do not wish to drag this on. We are of course not opposing a separate vote. If that is what colleagues call for, in this instance at least, we are not opposing that. My only point earlier was that, as this is all something new, it would have been helpful to have had a break to consider it. If it is in fact the view of the Chairman and others in this room that they do not wish to do that, I am not going to try to block us from moving ahead.

My point is therefore not some inward legal point relating to rule 120 or something; it was merely a matter of an opportunity to orderly arrange our business by being able to have a word among some of us as a result of a new development. But if others are not prepared to agree with that, I am not going to insist on the point. Of course, to answer Ambassador Rowe, the United Kingdom is certainly not objecting to anything that is being said. It was merely asking, as a matter of courtesy, whether one could have had a little more time. But if it is the view of others that we should proceed, the United Kingdom is not going to object any longer.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of Austria.

Mr. Charwath (Austria): Having just heard what was said by the representative of the United Kingdom, we will of course not stand in the way of proceeding. I just want to express our understanding that the only thing the representative of the United Kingdom said was that proceeding to take the vote was contingent upon the fact that we would vote on the draft resolution as a whole. The request for a little more time therefore seems to be very valid, and we would certainly support that. As the representative of the United Kingdom stated, those were two different issues, and we would not have proceeded to the vote. The United Kingdom would have asked for more time if we had known that we would take separate votes. I do not think this should be too difficult for delegations to agree, in the spirit of good cooperation we have enjoyed throughout the entire meeting.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of Sierra Leone.

Mr. Rowe (Sierra Leone): I am sorry to take the floor again. To get us out of this dilemma, may I suggest that the Chairman may want to consider requesting the representative of the United Kingdom to propose that we postpone the vote.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of Japan.

Mr. Mine (Japan): I heard two proposals: one for a suspension and one for a postponement. If we are going to suspend for an hour or so, I must say that our position would remain unchanged with regard to the change to the text read out by the representative of Iran. We would not have any time to consult our capital; Tokyo is now asleep. An hour's break would not help us.

The Chairman: Let us take stock of where we now stand.

Up until now, the Committee has accepted oral revisions made on the day that action was taken on draft resolutions, provided there were no requests to delay consideration. Today, for the first time during this session of the First Committee, we have a request to delay action on a draft resolution because a revision was made on the same day that action was to be taken.

Based on rule 120 of the provisional rules of procedure, and after reflection regarding cluster 1 and draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2, I was about to propose that we delay action until tomorrow. The representative of the United Kingdom then raised the original problem, namely, that we vote on the draft resolution as a whole. A separate vote was subsequently requested, complicating the situation.

If there is no strong objection, my overall proposal is that we delay action until tomorrow, based on rule of procedure 120. I know that some delegations will try to resort to rules 120 and 129 of the rules of procedure. Prior to that consideration, we were in a situation covered by rule 120. I therefore propose that we delay action on the draft resolution until tomorrow.

I call on the representative of Iran.

Mr. Bacidi-Nejad (Islamic Republic of Iran): As the representative of the United Kingdom has reiterated, I do not want to enter into interpretation of the rules of procedure. As we began our discussion, the

first priority was to give delegations more time to consider the revision orally presented. As was mentioned, it is a very straightforward revision. I think delegations can be very clear about their positions, because we have had this type of revision made to other draft resolutions submitted to the First Committee.

My delegation believes that draft resolution L.38/Rev.2 should be acted on today. As discussed, and as the Chairman decided, we have decided that action on the draft resolution can be delayed until the last part of our work today. What the representative of the United Kingdom has requested, namely, to suspend for half an hour to 45 minutes, is completely acceptable to us. But we believe that we should be ready after that to take a decision on the draft resolution today.

The Chairman: Does everyone agree that should suspend the meeting for about an hour?

I call on the representative of Mexico.

Mr. De Alba (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation is very concerned that the rules of procedure are not being followed. We have heard appeals to behave more humanely and in a more friendly and conciliatory manner. The delegation of Mexico has of course been very receptive to those appeals, but not to the point of changing the rules of procedure, which would have consequences for future decisions. It seems to us a very serious thing to so easily deviate from the rules.

I should simply like to recall that we are already halfway through the voting process. The rules could not be clearer: only points of order on the voting itself may interrupt the voting. There are no provisions for suspensions or requests for postponement of the vote. There are no grounds for any motion other than ones pertaining to the mechanics of the voting itself.

I am not going to propose any other delay to the Chairman. But I would ask that any suspension not be for more than 15 minutes and that no further exceptions be made to the rules of procedure. I believe it is important for the proper functioning of the Committee to observe the rules. I think a 15-minute suspension would be more than adequate. I have heard no objection to voting today from the representative of the United Kingdom. I have heard objections from a sponsor. I think the situation could not be clearer. In fact, we had a similar situation last year. At that time, it was very clearly established that a postponement of the vote on the day of the voting could be requested only by sponsors, otherwise revisions would be made on the day of voting. That would indefinitely result in delaying our decisions. I think that was very clear indeed during last years' consideration of The Hague Code of Conduct, and we could use that as a reference for us today.

My proposal therefore is that, if clarifications are needed, we suspend the meeting for no more than 15 minutes, and then immediately proceed to vote.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of Cuba.

Mr. Gala López (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I shall be very brief. My delegation would also like to place on the record its own concerns with regard to how the voting process is currently being carried out. It seems to us that the rules of procedure are very clear as to the voting process. I simply wanted to place that on the record.

The Chairman: As there are no other requests for the floor, I therefore intend to suspend the meeting for 20 minutes.

The meeting was suspended at 11.20 a.m. and resumed at 11.40 a.m.

The Chairman: Let us resume action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2.

Mr. Freeman (United Kingdom): I thank you, Sir, and other colleagues for agreeing to the break, which we appreciated. I want to take this opportunity to say that the States members of the European Union will vote against the proposed amendment of the sixth preambular paragraph, as we will to the draft resolution as a whole.

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to a separate vote on the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2, as orally revised by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Brazil, Brunei

Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nigeria, Oman, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Bhutan, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Kenya, Malawi, Mauritius, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Russian Federation, Uruguay

The sixth preambular paragraph, as orally revised, was retained by 58 votes to 54, with 23 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2 as a whole.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Bolivia, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Liberia, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Tuvalu, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2 as a whole was adopted by 70 votes to 52, with 22 abstentions.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes on the draft resolution just adopted.

Ms. Sanders (United States of America): I have asked for the floor to explain the United States vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2, entitled "Follow-up to nuclear disarmament obligations agreed in the 1995 and 2000 Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons".

Our delegation could not agree more that there is a need for full compliance with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and, indeed, with all non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament obligations undertaken by States. That, after all, is why we have sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1*.

Draft resolution L.38/Rev.2 completely misses the mark. It shrouds proliferation and non-compliance under the false mantle of the pace of disarmament of the nuclear-weapon States. That comes at the price of our common security. One only needs to identify the sponsor of the draft resolution to grasp its disingenuous nature. The sponsor of the draft resolution, after all, is none other than the State that the International Atomic Energy Agency Board of Governors, just over a month ago, found to be in non-compliance with its nuclear non-proliferation obligations.

As for the text of the draft resolution itself, we note that the versions before us today no longer sought to establish an ad hoc committee under the General Assembly. Those who strongly support the NPT wisely rejected such a misguided proposal, for a formal review of the NPT is the rightful preserve of States parties to the Treaty.

The last thing that this Committee needs is yet another resolution dealing with nuclear disarmament. That shared objective is being pursued in good faith and in a transparent manner, and steady, measurable progress is a matter of public record. What the world does need is sincere, rigorous compliance on the part of all nations with their international obligations, including their non-proliferation obligations. The time for paying lip service to treaty compliance has long passed. The time is at hand to address the real threats to our common security and for the international community to call upon all States to comply with their international non-proliferation obligations. As we noted earlier, widespread international support for the IAEA Board of Governors' recent finding of non-compliance is a step in the right direction.

The United States voted against draft resolution L.38/Rev.2 for all of those reasons. Having done so, we are pleased to find ourselves in very good company indeed.

Mr. De Alba (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mexico's vote was consistent with the historical stance of its Government in favour of nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction through observance of and full compliance with the relevant provisions of international law. Mexico stresses that nuclear disarmament is not an option, but a legal obligation for all countries.

In voting in favour of the draft resolution, Mexico stresses the urgent need for substantive progress in the application of the provisions of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), in particular with regard to the measures adopted at the 1995 and 2000 Review Conferences.

Mexico appeals once again to the States of the community of nations, in particular the State that presented the draft resolution, to act in accordance with the commitments entered into in the context of international disarmament instruments, organizations and bodies, and to comply with the verification mechanisms in the area of nuclear disarmament that would make possible the achievement of such an objective.

We stress once again the urgent need to destroy all nuclear stockpiles and to apply measures to prevent any further proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or their use by any country, given that all such weapons are fundamentally inhumane.

Mr. Prasad (India): India abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2. Our delegation voted against the sixth preambular paragraph, as orally revised, because we cannot accept the call for universal adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the placement of facilities under full-scope International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards.

India supports the stated goal of the draft resolution, namely, to provide impetus to efforts to achieve the goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, and is committed to global non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament. However, the draft resolution is embedded in the NPT framework and pertains to States parties to the NPT, to which we are not a party.

Mrs. Fernando (Sri Lanka): Sri Lanka voted in flavour of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2, given our unwavering support for the regime of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and all its objectives. In our view, the NPT represents a careful balance of obligations of States parties aimed at preventing both vertical and horizontal proliferation.

We remain fully committed to both of those objectives on equal terms. However, the text of draft resolution L.38/Rev.2 seems to focus on only one aspect of the NPT, that is, the vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons connected with article VI. While we support the draft resolution, we regret that lack of balance; it will not assist in strengthening the NPT regime.

Mr. Shamaa (Egypt): I am not speaking in explanation of vote, but making a statement following the vote on the draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2.

The vote on the sixth preambular paragraph came as a shocking surprise to us. As we said when speaking in explanation of vote, the sixth preambular paragraph did not contain the perfect language that we would have liked to see, but it recalled one of the main pillars relating to the indefinite extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We are extremely disappointed, and I am sure that my feelings reflect those of all the Arab States in this room with regard to the 54 countries that voted against one essential pillar of the NPT regarding that Treaty's indefinite extension.

That only confirms that the lack of consensus on the outcome of the 2005 Review Conference and the lack of any outcome in the summit document are merely the result of the politicization of the disarmament and NPT commitments on the part of those States parties to the NPT who voted against the sixth preambular paragraph, contrary to their commitments in the context of the NPT and the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The Chairman: The Committee will move on to cluster 4, "Conventional weapons", which contains one draft resolution: A/C.1/60/L.40/Rev.1. The floor is open for general statements or the introduction of draft resolutions.

Mr. Rivasseau (France) (*spoke in French*): I would like briefly to raise two small points relating to draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.40/Rev.1.

First, I draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that the delegations of France and Germany failed to mention one linguistic revision to the text. Operative paragraph 6 should read

(*spoke in English*)

> "Decides to include this issue in the provisional agenda of its sixty-first session".

(*spoke in French*)

Secondly, I understand that, as a result of the suspension of the meeting on this issue, the delegation that had requested the postponement of a decision is now in a position to proceed. France is still working on the assumption that we will be able to proceed on the basis of consensus.

The Chairman: The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.40/Rev.1, as orally revised by the representative of France.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the First Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.40/Rev.1 is entitled "Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of France at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 14 October, and has been orally revised by the representative of France. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.40/Rev.1, A/C.1/60/INF/2* and INF/2/Add.1. In addition, Guinea, Ireland and Malta have become sponsors.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

> *Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.40/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Prasad (India): India joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.40/Rev.1. We would like to place on record our understanding that the draft resolution appeals only to interested States to assess their stockpiles of ammunition on a voluntary basis. Thus, while States wishing to do so on a voluntary basis may share with others information on the outcome of such an assessment, the draft resolution does not create any obligation for States to make available to other States any information on the outcome of their assessment of ammunition stockpiles, including information on the security, management and destruction of such stockpiles.

Ms. Leong (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.40/Rev.1, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela wishes to reaffirm the legitimate sovereign right of all States to obtain, produce and retain the quantity of conventional arms and ammunition they deem appropriate to meet their legitimate self-defence and security needs.

Our country supports efforts to combat and prevent the illicit trade in ammunition. However, we believe that it is up to each country to determine — in a sovereign and voluntary manner in keeping with its own legitimate defence and security needs — whether or not a portion of its existing conventional ammunition can be considered surplus. It is also up to each State to determine whether the amount and the nature of its ammunition might represent a risk to its own security and whether measures must be taken to improve the management and stockpiling of its existing conventional ammunition.

The Chairman: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of position.

I should like to inform members that at its final meeting tomorrow, the Committee will first take action on the two remaining draft resolutions: A/C.1/60/L.50/Rev.1 and L.59/Rev.1. Immediately thereafter, we will proceed to consider and take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.60, under agenda item 88, entitled "Question on Antarctica". The Committee also needs to take action on item 116, on the revitalization of the work of the General Assembly, particularly with regard to our tentative programme of work for the next session.

The representative of France has requested the floor.

Mr. Rivasseau (France) (*spoke in French*): My delegation would like to go back to the conditions under which draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.39, "Preventing the risk of radiological terrorism", was adopted at the 21st meeting, at the end of last week. Members will recall that a vote had been requested, but all delegations voted in favour. It seems that the delegations present in the room did not request the vote. I wonder whether there was not a misunderstanding about that situation. Some contacts with the Secretariat incline me to urge you, Mr. Chairman, to ascertain whether the fact that the draft resolution was put to the vote reflected a misunderstanding. If that is the case, I ask that you point it out in the General Assembly so that the Assembly is aware that the draft was indeed put to the vote in error.

The Chairman: I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Just to answer the representative of France precisely: yes, there was a misunderstanding.

The Chairman: Therefore, unless I hear an objection from the floor, we will consider draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.39 to have been adopted by consensus.

Mr. De Alba (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): It is my understanding that the delegation of France indicated that it is appropriate to report the error to the plenary of the General Assembly when the Committee's report is considered. I would be most willing to support that request, especially because I am familiar with the error that was made. But I do not believe it is appropriate to revise a decision already taken by the Committee.

Mr. Rivasseau (France) (*spoke in French*): I agree with the representative of Mexico; sometimes I am pleased to agree with him.

The Chairman: So we finally have agreement on this issue.

I now give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): I almost hesitate to make the following request: members, please fill out your surveys. Thank you.

The Chairman: I invite the Under-Secretary-General to take the floor.

Mr. Abe (Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs): I wish to remind Committee members that they still have the task of nominating the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee and the President of the Review Conference for the Programme of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons. The Committee will recall that I conducted the informal session, during which I told members that I would reconvene the session when they were ready to confirm the nomination of the Chairman and the President. So far, as I understand, the process has not been finalized. I therefore strongly encourage members to finalize the process so that we can nominate the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee and the President of the Review Conference next year before we finish the work of the First Committee and disperse.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.